

# The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JUNE 21, 1884.

## CURRENT TOPICS.

By A MEMORANDUM as to affidavits of service recently issued to the chancery registrars, "The Lord Justice Corron desires the registrars to be informed that the mode of entering in an order affidavits of service not sworn on the day of the date of the order has been considered by himself and other members of the Court of Appeal, and they consider that the registrars may accept, until an opinion of the court is expressed to the contrary effect, affidavits of service sworn and filed at any time before the order is drawn up. But if the affidavit is sworn after the date of the order, the order is not to be post-dated, and the affidavit is not to be entered formally as evidence. The registrars are, in such case, to make a memorandum in the margin of the order that the affidavit of service has been sworn and filed; and the recital may be introduced into the order, 'No one appearing for A. B., although duly served, &c., as by affidavit appears.'" This will give to the registrars a wider margin than we had anticipated, and will avoid a difficulty which often arose before the taxing master when the plaintiff having had his affidavit of service ready in court in accordance with the rule, the defendant appeared, and the affidavit was not wanted, and was, therefore, not read in the order. There appears to be no real necessity that the affidavit should be ready before it is wanted. If the plaintiff or the moving party knows that the notice is served, and that the service is good, there can be no abstract necessity for proving such service until it is known that the proof is required.

It is, perhaps, hardly possible to say at present, with certainty, how far the new arrangements with regard to circuits are likely to prove satisfactory; but, on the whole, so far as we can judge, the scheme seems a well-considered one. Certain results attained are clearly a great gain. It always appeared to us perfectly monstrous to send equity judges to try murders and other criminal cases while their proper functions were performed by common law judges. This will no longer be the case. Again, the block of business in the Court of Appeal is now so great that the exemption of the Lords Justices from the necessity of going circuit in order that there might be continuous sittings of both Appeal Courts had become almost a necessity. The general scope of the alterations with regard to the circuits may be briefly indicated. The main feature of the plan by which the judge-power of the country is to be economized is that, to the great majority of assize towns throughout the country—viz., forty-one out of fifty-four—one judge only is to be sent. With one or two trifling exceptions, however, it would appear that every county and town is to have its assizes, both criminal and civil, as before. We have always been under the impression that the power of resistance and pressure that could be brought to bear by any county or borough which was threatened with deprivation of its assizes would prove to be too great to permit of any scheme which involved such deprivation being politically possible, and such seems, in fact, to have been the case; for it is no secret that the scheme, as ultimately settled, has been considerably modified from that originally devised, in deference to objections raised by counties which it was proposed to deprive of their civil assizes. The result of the change will be that on the early part of the circuits nine judges only will be absent from town, and on the later part ten. It would have seemed *a priori* probable that it would follow from the new arrangements that the total duration of the circuits must be considerably greater, inasmuch as in most places one judge is to do the work which two have heretofore done. On looking, however, through the list of fixtures made by the judges at the different places for the

ensuing circuits, it does not strike us that the total duration of the circuits is, as a rule, much increased. It may be that the expectation of business is not very large on the ensuing circuits; but if it proves to be the case that, as a rule, the duration of the circuits is not much increased under the new arrangements, it will show conclusively the economy of judges' time effected. We must confess to feeling some apprehension lest, on occasion, under exceptional circumstances, a good deal of pressure may be produced at one-judge towns owing to unusual and unexpected amounts of criminal work cropping up. This was, within the experience of those familiar with the existing circuit arrangements, every now and then the case, even under the old two-judge system. It was met in practice by turning on commissioners from the ranks of Queen's Counsel—a not very satisfactory expedient. There is, we observe, to be a power of sending down an additional judge from London to meet an emergency of this kind, and, of course, recourse can be had to commissioners, as before; but there may be somewhat greater difficulty in obtaining their services, as, we suppose, under the new régime, the criminal business will have to be disposed of before the civil business begins at each town, and therefore the Queen's Counsel may not be in attendance.

IN A LETTER to the *Times* Mr. W. T. S. DANIEL, Q.C., makes some most pertinent remarks upon the causes which have led to the failure of the new Bankruptcy Act to accomplish one of its professed objects—viz., to compel every insolvent debtor, before being allowed to make any arrangement with his creditors, to submit to a public examination at the hands of the Board of Trade. Mr. DANIEL's great experience on the county court bench as judge of some of the most important bankruptcy districts, comprising great commercial centres, gives much weight to any remarks or suggestions which he may have to make upon this subject. He attributes the large decrease of the number of cases in bankruptcy under the Act to the unsound principle upon which the new Act is based—viz., that the debtor and his creditors are not the only persons interested in the insolvency, but that the public have a paramount interest therein, and have the right to ascertain, by a public examination, the causes of the failure. And he condemns this interference as a theoretical invention, for which no demand on the part of the public has ever been made, and as essentially inquisitorial and opposed to sound public feeling. There is no doubt that the view to which Mr. DANIEL gives expression is gaining ground in commercial circles, and that a strong reaction is setting in against the officialism of the new Act. This can scarcely be wondered at when, in so many cases, the wishes of creditors, whether it be to accept a composition or scheme of arrangement, or to appoint a particular trustee, are overruled at the instigation of the Board of Trade. The fact seems to be lost sight of that it is the creditors who have the most to do with the making or marring of a bankruptcy system, and that a system which does not recommend itself to them to some reasonable extent cannot possibly succeed. The public, as a body, take but a passive interest in these matters; but creditors, having something substantial at stake, are apt to inquire into them a little more closely.

THE CASE of *Attorney-General v. Bradlaugh* was tried at bar because it was deemed to be doubtful whether an appeal could be brought, and it was, therefore, thought that the decision of three judges would be more satisfactory than the decision of one upon the important question involved. The doubt as to the appeal springs, we suppose, from *Attorney-General v. Radloff* (10 Ex. 84), in which the Court of Exchequer was equally divided upon the question whether an information by the Crown for a penalty under the revenue laws was a criminal proceeding, so as to exclude

the evidence of the defendant. This case led to three legislative attempts to admit the evidence of the defendant (17 & 18 Vict. c. 122, s. 15; 18 & 19 Vict. c. 96, s. 36; and 20 & 21 Vict. c. 62), which culminated in section 34 of the Crown Suits Act, 1865 (28 & 29 Vict. c. 104), whereby the defendant was finally and completely made an admissible witness. Nothing, however, was done towards making revenue proceedings civil instead of criminal, and as the Judicature Act, 1873, s. 47, expressly prohibits an appeal in criminal proceedings, it was thought that an information by the Crown for a penalty would be criminal within these words, which have hitherto been construed with some strictness against the right of appeal. Inasmuch as the schedule to the Judicature Act, 1875, which abolished proceedings in error, did not apply to revenue proceedings, we incline to think that the appeal, which undoubtedly existed before that Act, has not been taken away; but the point is, of course, a doubtful one. It is, however, undoubted that if an appeal lies at all, it lies no less from the ruling of three judges in a trial at bar, than from the ruling of one at *Nisi Prius*.

A CORRESPONDENT sends us a very remarkable specimen of the legal opinions given by journals professing to advise mercantile men. In answer to a correspondent, the editor of one of these papers says:—

"Z. Z. Z.—You have lent A. a certain sum of money on the security of a mortgage on his house, and he wishes to deduct income tax from the amount of the interest due to you. We do not know what authority he can have for making such claim, as we know of none."

It would appear that the writer had never heard of 5 & 6 Vict. c. 35, ss. 102, 103, or of the provisions of the Property Tax Act of 1853 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 34); section 40 of which provides that "every person who shall be liable to the payment of . . . any yearly interest of money, . . . whether the same shall be received or payable half-yearly, or at any shorter or more distant periods, shall be entitled, and is hereby authorized, on making such payment, to deduct and retain thereout the amount of the rate of duty which, at the time when such payment becomes due, shall be payable for every twenty shillings of such payment; and the person liable to such payment shall be acquitted and discharged of so much money as such deduction shall amount unto, as if the amount thereof had actually been paid unto the person to whom such payment shall have been due and payable; and the person to whom such payment as aforesaid is to be made shall allow such deduction upon receipt of the residue of such money, under pain of forfeiting the sum of £50 for any refusal so to do." Soon after the passing of this Act a question arose as to the meaning of the expression "yearly" interest of money. Vice-Chancellor Wood, having referred to the Inland Revenue authorities for information as to the practice, said, in *Bebb v. Bunney* (1 K. & J. 216), that, "It appears never to have been doubted that, under section 40, the tax upon interest on mortgages should be deducted; and that in practice the mortgagor, in all cases, deducts the tax. And I have been told that prosecutions have been instituted against mortgagees to recover the penalty for refusing to allow such deductions, and that such penalty has been paid before proceeding to trial." And he held that the expression "yearly interest" meant "all interest at a yearly rate, and which may have to be paid *de anno in annum*, such as . . . mortgage interest." We may add that a subsequent statute, 27 Vict. c. 18, s. 13, provides for the deduction from yearly interest of "the amount of the rate, or a proportionate amount of the several rates, of income tax which were chargeable by law upon or in respect of such . . . interest . . . during the period through which the same was accruing due."

MR. McIVER has directed the attention of the House of Commons to the constitution of the Board of Trade, and states his determination still further to press Mr. CHAMBERLAIN with questions on the point. The statutory history of the Board is this: "The office or establishment commonly known by the name of the Board of Trade and Plantations" was, together with the office of master of the harriers, the office of the great wardrobe, and other offices, "utterly suppressed, abolished, and taken away" in 1781, by 22 Geo. 3, and the duties of the office were directed, by section 15 of that

Act, to be exercised "by any committee or committees of his Majesty's Privy Council which his Majesty shall be pleased to appoint during his royal pleasure, without any salary." A salary, however, of £2,000 a year was directed to be paid by 57 Geo. 3, c. 76, to the vice-president of the committee, and a like salary to the president by 7 Geo. 4, c. 32. The office of vice-president was abolished by 30 & 31 Vict. c. 72, and a secretary qualified to sit in Parliament, commonly called the Parliamentary Secretary, substituted. Mr. McIVER appears to complain that by a certain Order in Council of 1786, the Speaker of the then existing Irish House of Commons was made an *ex officio* member of the committee; but Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, while admitting that such Order of Council still regulates the legal constitution of the Board, has declined to "answer any further question without notice."

MR. CHARLES BEAVAN, whose death on Wednesday is announced, might probably claim the distinction of being in legal circles and publications the "most mentioned" man of his day. There are comparatively few important cases tried in the Chancery Division in which "Beavan" is not cited; and the familiar abbreviation "Beav." frequently occurs in treatises dealing with any branch of real property law or equity. The first case reported by Mr. BEAVAN was *Tullett v. Armstrong*, decided by Lord LANGDALE in 1838, and the last case was *Gee v. Liddell*, decided by Lord ROMILLY in 1866. Between 1840 and 1868 thirty-five volumes of his reports appeared, both Lord LANGDALE and Lord ROMILLY supplying to him copies of their written judgments and correcting notes of judgments orally delivered. It was Mr. BEAVAN's boast that he had survived the attacks of six different sets of opposition reports; and after the *Law Reports* were instituted, Lord ROMILLY continued to supply exclusively to Mr. BEAVAN the copies of his judgments, until in June, 1866, the reporter became Examiner in the Court of Chancery.

## THE EFFECT OF "VESTING STREETS" IN LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

THE recent case of *The Wandsworth Board of Works v. The United Telephone Company* (reported in another column) raised a point of considerable importance and interest to urban authorities. By the Metropolis Management Act in the metropolis, and by the Public Health Act, 1875, in the other urban districts, the streets are vested in the local authority, and the question has arisen in various cases what the legal effect of such "vesting" of the "street" is. In the case in question the defendants had carried one of their wires over the High-street in Putney at a height of about thirty feet from the ground, fastened to the chimneys. The district board sued for an injunction to prevent their continuing such wire in that position. Stephen, J., before whom the case was tried, found that the wire caused no appreciable danger to the highway, and was not an indictable nuisance. He decided the case, however, in favour of the plaintiffs, apparently on the ground that the vesting of the street by the Act in the plaintiffs gave to them, and was intended to give to them, proprietary rights over the space above the street to a height including the position of the wire, and that there was, therefore, a trespass upon their property. The Court of Appeal reversed his judgment.

Briefly summarized, the law, as laid down in this and other decisions, seems to come to this. The "vesting" of the "street" gives more than a mere surface easement. The word "street," on the other hand, does not mean a certain area of land carrying with it the legal right to possession of an indefinite space above and below as in the case of an ordinary conveyance of a close of land. It only involves so much land as fairly may be said to be "street," according to the ordinary user of streets. Of so much, however, it gives more than mere management and control as a street; it gives the ownership, with the ordinary rights of ownership, so far as is consistent with the public user: for instance, the local authority may demise the pasturage upon the roads (*Coverdale v. Charlton*, L. R. 4 Q. B. D. 104). So, also, it has been held that



they have the soil below the surface so far as co-extensive with the "area of ordinary user as a street," to use the words of Fry, L.J., in dealing with the subject. On the other hand, the vesting of the street in the local authority does not vest in them mines situated below the area of ordinary user. This view seems to be good common sense, but, of course, questions of difficulty might arise as to its application. Applying it to the case before them, the Court of Appeal came to the conclusion that, as the wire was far too high to interfere in any way with the ordinary traffic of the street, and no danger was shown to arise from it, the plaintiffs were not entitled to the injunction they claimed.

It does not seem to us that there is any real conflict between Stephen, J., and the Court of Appeal on the legal principle involved. We take it that the learned judge in the court below admitted fully the principle that the area included in the term "street" is limited and does not extend *usque ad cælum* or *ad medium terræ*. The difference really seems to have been on the question how much upwards must be considered as included in the street. It was one of those questions of degree which depend, after all, mainly on considerations of expediency and customary usage rather than on principle, and was capable of being decided either way without absurdity. Stephen, J., thought it within the intention of the Legislature that the local authority should have control over the space above the street—as far, at any rate, as the tops of the chimneys—so that they might exercise their discretion as to matters which, though not absolute nuisances to the street, might be considered objectionable innovations. Some force seems to be given to this view by the consideration that local authorities are invested with various powers having regard to matters of appearance, regularity of frontage, and so forth, in streets, which have no connection with the user of the street as a highway. But, on the whole, perhaps, the sounder view is that taken by the Court of Appeal, which confines the word "street" to that portion of space within the limits of the ordinary user of the street as an urban highway. The enactments vesting the street in the local authority appear, from the collocation of sections, to have relation to highway purposes, and the consequences of holding that the space above the streets as high as the house-tops vested in the local authority would be very sweeping. No person could stick anything out of his window or against his house, so as to project to the smallest extent over the roadway, however far above the traffic, without technically committing a trespass on the soil of the local authority. It may be observed that the question of danger to the highway is not involved, for it seems clear that, in respect of any dangerous erection above the height included in the term "street," the local authority might, in virtue of their interest and functions with regard to the street, obtain an injunction.

A curious technical question, however, arises which would have sorely exercised the wits of our ancient lawyers if it could have arisen in their time. In whom is the space above the roadway which is too high up to be included in the term "street" vested? Does it belong to the owner of the *strata* below the street, the street being interposed as a kind of slice, like the ham in a sandwich, or does it belong to nobody? If the shades of Littleton, Coke, and other ancient legal worthies walk the earth unseen by mortal eye, and interest themselves in current legal questions, what a wealth of matter for ingenious speculation and argument is thus afforded them wherewith to beguile their learned leisure!

When Queen's Bench Court No. 1, composed of Field, Manisty, and Lopes, JJ., sat on Saturday morning to hear new trial cases, it was found in the first four cases that the judge's notes on the former trials had either not been paid for or bespoken, and as no one appeared in the fifth case, the whole of them were struck out, and the judges rose for the day.

On Tuesday, while a case was being tried before Mr. Justice A. L. Smith and a common jury, the court adjourned at about half-past one for lunch. At two o'clock the jurors and counsel had re-assembled when, to their astonishment, Mr. Justice Stephen, whose court also had adjourned for lunch, entered the court, took his seat on the bench, and was apparently about to resume the trial of an action which had been begun by Mr. Justice A. L. Smith. Mr. McIntyre, Q.C., evidently somewhat embarrassed at having to open the case for a defendant before a judge who has not heard the case for the plaintiff, ventured to ask whether, amid the intricacies of the new building, his lordship had not lost his way and come into the wrong court. It appeared that this was so, and Mr. Justice Stephen retired amid some amusement.

## THE BANKRUPTCY ACT IN OPERATION.

A NUMBER of very important points of law and practice under the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, have come before the Court of Appeal and Mr. Justice Cave since the Whitsuntide recess. The case which will probably create the greatest amount of interest is that of *Ex parte Clark*, before the Court of Appeal, reported in another column. In that case the debtors, who carried on business as bookbinders, presented a bankruptcy petition under the new Act, and at the necessary statutory meetings, under section 18, the creditors resolved upon a scheme of arrangement, which provided that the estate should vest in a trustee thereby appointed; that the business should be carried on under the direction of a committee of inspection, consisting of three creditors; and that the debtors should be discharged when the committee of inspection should so resolve. On the application for the approval of the court to this scheme, the official receiver reported that he had no reason to believe that the debtors had committed any misdemeanor under the Act, or under Part II. of the Debtors Act, 1869; and that no facts had come to his knowledge which induced him to believe that the debtors had committed any of the offences referred to in sub-section 3 of section 28 which would disentitle the debtors, in the discretion of the court, to an unconditional discharge. He, however, took an objection that, inasmuch as the creditors had no power under the Act to suspend or grant the discharge of a debtor, such power could not be conferred by them upon the committee of inspection. This view was also taken by the registrar, who accordingly refused to approve the scheme, and from this refusal the appeal was brought. In the result, the Court of Appeal (consisting of Baggallay, Cotton, and Lindley, L.JJ.) confirmed the decision of the registrar.

So far as the judgment must be considered a binding authority, the Lords Justices confined themselves to the precise point in the case; and though expressing views upon other points of the greatest importance, they were careful not to do so as to decide those points in the case before them. The grounds of their judgment they stated to be that the granting of the discharge being left in the discretion of the committee of inspection, that was a provision of an unreasonable character which was not contemplated by the Act, and was contrary to its intention. Having regard to the provisions and policy of the Act itself, we do not see how any other decision could very well be come to. One leading object of the Act was to deprive the creditors, as a body, of the power to grant or withhold the discharge of a debtor, and to vest that power in the court; and even under the late Act, which specially intrusted the creditors with that power, it was held that they could not delegate it to any other person or persons (*Ex parte Hope, Re Hope*, 27 W. R. 7, L. R. 9 Ch. D. 398). At the same time, it is to be feared that the decision will have the effect of hampering, if not preventing, the carrying out under the Act of a kind of arrangement often desirable, and not unfrequently resorted to in former times, in the cases of old-established businesses.

But the court suggested a modification of the scheme upon the question of discharge, which they intimated they might have been inclined to approve, so as to get over the difficulty experienced by the resolutions as passed. If an immediate discharge had been made a part of the scheme; or if there had been no reference at all made to the discharge in the resolutions; or if the discharge had been postponed to some definite time, or made dependent upon some act of the debtors themselves, it is probable that the sanction of the court would have been given to the scheme. It was only the assumption of the power to invest other persons with the jurisdiction to grant or withhold the discharge, when and as long as they might think proper, that was fatal to the scheme resolved upon by the creditors. This expression of their opinion, however, they were very careful to guard against being taken as a binding decision; but it seems to us that any one of the modifications suggested would be a reasonable scheme, and within the purview of the Act.

Another point mentioned in the case, and commented upon by Baggallay, L.J., in his judgment, was as to the construction of section 44 read in conjunction with sub-section 13 of section 18 in the case of a scheme of arrangement under the latter section. Section 44, so far as it affected the case in question, is as follows: "The property of the *bankrupt* divisible among his creditors, and in this Act referred to as the property of the *bankrupt*, . . .

shall comprise the following particulars: (i.) All such property as may belong to, or be vested in, the bankrupt at the commencement of the bankruptcy, or may be acquired, or devolve on him before his discharge." Sub-section 13 of section 18 provides:—"Part III. of this Act" [which consists of sections 37 to 65] "shall, so far as the nature of the case and the terms of the composition or scheme admit, apply thereto, the same interpretation being given to the words 'trustee,' 'bankruptcy,' 'bankrupt,' and 'order of adjudication,' as in the last preceding sub-section"—that is to say, "as if the terms 'bankruptcy,' 'bankrupt,' and 'order of adjudication,' included respectively a composition or scheme of arrangement, a compounding or arranging debtor, and order approving the composition or scheme." As was pointed out by Baggalay, L.J., section 18 contains no reference to any order of discharge of the debtor in the case of a composition or scheme under that section, the provisions as to the order of discharge in the case of a bankruptcy contained in section 28 not being made applicable in any way to a composition or scheme. By the aid of sub-section 13 of section 18 he thought that section 44, in the case of a scheme of arrangement, should be read as if the words "date of the order approving the scheme" were substituted for "commencement of the bankruptcy." In this way he expressed an opinion that the Act appeared to contemplate the discharge as possibly occurring at a period subsequent to the commencement of the scheme, and that any property accruing to the debtor before that period would be distributable amongst the creditors. This certainly appears to us also to be the true construction of the sections read together, and it was upon the basis of this construction that the suggested modifications of the scheme were founded.

This decision is the first that has yet been given by the Court of Appeal upon the construction of any of the provisions in section 18, and is of the greatest importance for future guidance. The decision in the case of *Ex parte Rogers*, also reported elsewhere, almost completes the exposition of the general practice under that section. In the last-mentioned case, the Divisional Court of the Queen's Bench Division, on Wednesday last, affirmed the principle on which the judge of the Liverpool County Court has acted in refusing to confirm resolutions accepting compositions agreed to by the statutory majority of creditors. In the case in question the county court judge had based his decision partly on the ground that the proofs of debts had not been inquired into, but he also relied on the fact that one of the acts mentioned in sub-section 3 of section 28 had been committed by the debtor. On both grounds the Divisional Court held that the discretion vested in the judge by section 18, sub-section 6, had been rightly exercised. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that this appeal did not come in the first instance to the Court of Appeal, but only to a divisional court of the Queen's Bench Division, under the Act of the present session, as the question will scarcely be considered finally disposed of until the decision of the higher court has been obtained.

The decision of Cave, J., in *Ex parte McAlpine*, noted last week (*ante*, p. 578), although upon another and merely temporary section of the Act, is also not without a bearing upon the question of the approval or otherwise of schemes of arrangement under section 18. That decision proceeded upon section 170, which relates only to proceedings instituted under the late Act. In that case the debtor had filed a petition for liquidation or composition under the late Act, and his statement of affairs showed his liabilities to be £17,770, and his assets £1,211. The creditors resolved upon liquidation, but this was opposed by one creditor on the ground that it would not be for the general benefit of the creditors, inasmuch as an excessive value had been put upon the assets, which were really valueless. The section provides that, after the passing of the Act, no composition or arrangement under the late Act shall be allowed without the sanction of the court exercising jurisdiction, and that "such sanction shall not be granted unless the composition or liquidation appears to the court or registrar to be reasonable, and calculated to benefit the general body of creditors." These words are almost identical with the words used in sub-section 6 of section 18—viz., "If the court is of opinion that the terms of the composition or scheme are not reasonable, or are not calculated to benefit the general body of creditors, . . . the court shall . . . refuse to approve the composition or scheme." Upon the words of section 170, Cave, J., upheld the decision of the county court judge refusing to sanction the liquidation, although it was urged that the statement of affairs was conclusive, and could not

be gone behind. He considered the statement a mere sham, and that the resolutions had been passed for the sole benefit of the debtor. Applying this decision to the words of sub-section 6 of section 18, quoted above, it may be taken that, upon a similar state of circumstances, the court would be compelled to refuse its approval to a similar scheme under the new Act.

In the case of *Ex parte Beesty*, before Cave, J., on the same date, also noted by us last week (*ante*, p. 578), a question of jurisdiction under section 102 of the new Act (which, with the exception of the introduction of certain provisions limiting the jurisdiction, is substantially the same as section 72 of the late Act) was raised. In that case an application was made on behalf of Mr. Beesty for an order that Messrs. Glyn, Mills, & Co., bankers, should deliver up to him the warrants for certain sheepskins which had been deposited by the bankrupt with them as security for advances. The bankrupt's estate seems to have had no interest in the goods, so that the question resolved itself into one between third parties only. It seems rather late in the day for jurisdiction to be claimed for the court under bankruptcy proceedings in such a case, and no surprise need be felt at the decision refusing the application on that ground. The same point was raised before Bacon, C.J., in the early history of the late Act, in the case of *Ex parte The North-West Bank, Re Slee* (20 W. R. 980), and was decided by him in the same way, and that decision has never been questioned.

Lastly, the proceedings instituted by the Board of Trade against Messrs. Dubois and Brett, as trustees in the liquidation of James Pearce, were advanced a further stage by the making of an order by Cave, J., on the application of the Solicitor-General, for the committal of Mr. Dubois for contempt of court in not paying the sum of £158 ordered to be paid by him and his co-trustee as money in their hands belonging to the estate. The proceedings taken by the Board of Trade in this case form a wholesome lesson to trustees under the late Act, and expose one of the greatest weaknesses of that Act—viz., the almost complete immunity from control enjoyed by trustees in liquidation. There is no doubt that this has been the cause of most of the scandals and mischief arising under that Act, and has brought about the change in the opposite direction effected by the new Act, which probably errs as much on the side of stringency as the late system did on the side of laxity.

## REVIEWS.

### BANKRUPTCY.

A TREATISE ON THE LAW AND PRACTICE IN BANKRUPTCY UNDER THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883, THE BANKRUPTCY APPEALS (COUNTY COURTS) ACT, 1884, AND THE RULES AND FORMS. By THEODORE RIBTON, Barrister-at-Law. W. Clowes & Sons (Limited).

This edition of the Bankruptcy Act resembles most of its predecessors in the general plan of its arrangement, the Act itself being printed with intersectional notes, while the Rules, Forms, and Orders, the Debtors and Bills of Sale Acts, follow without any commentary. The aim of his treatise, the author says in his preface, is "to present in a practical form the law and practice under the Acts of 1883 and 1884, and the Rules of Court." There being thus nothing strikingly original in the form or object of the book, it must depend for its success on the excellence of the workmanship alone. The lateness of its publication inclines us to be somewhat critical in this respect; but, after a careful examination of several of Mr. Ribton's notes, we may say that he almost always states with clearness and precision the results of the cases which he cites, and that all the leading decisions in bankruptcy law will be found in their appropriate places. A generation of ephemeral publications on the Bankruptcy Act may be said to have passed away, but there remain a sufficient number of formidable rivals to dispute the field with any new aspirant for popular favour. We do not doubt that Mr. Ribton's book will successfully hold its own, and it possesses one advantage over the treatises of earlier date, inasmuch as it contains references to all the cases which have been actually decided upon the construction of the Act.

Some slight inaccuracies, rather of language than of substance, we have noticed in our perusal of this work; as, for example, in the note to section 2, where it is stated that the Act affects only English subjects or foreigners who come "within the allegiance of the English Crown." Mr. Ribton, we do not doubt, knows very well that there is no such thing as an "English Crown" distinct



from the sovereignty of any other part of the United Kingdom; and he seems to have fallen into error by accepting without examination the head-note to *Ex parte Blain* (L. R. 12 Ch. D. 822) as an accurate statement of the law. Again, at p. 4, it is laid down that "a firm may be a debtor." This is not justified by anything in the Act or Rules, and is contrary to the doctrine of English law as to the legal status of a partnership firm. Proceedings may, indeed, be taken against partners in the name of the firm (section 115), but this is merely for convenience of procedure; and accordingly we find that the rules provide that a receiving order made against a firm is to operate as if it were made against each of the partners (rule 195); and, further, that no order of adjudication is to be made against a firm in the firm name, but only against the partners individually (rule 197). One of the conditions which must be satisfied in order to enable a creditor to present a petition is that "the debtor is domiciled in England, or, within a year before the date of the presentation of the petition, has ordinarily resided, or had a dwelling-house or place of business, in England." Upon this enactment Mr. Ribton says (p. 19), "It must, however, be borne in mind that the Bankruptcy Act is a special code of law relating to bankruptcy, as a general rule for commercial men, and the words used in it should be taken in the sense in which commercial men use them." For this proposition he refers to *Ex parte Hillman* (27 W. R. 567, L. R. 10 Ch. D. 622), a decision on section 91 of the Act of 1869, and then applies it in the following manner to the subject of domicile:—"The same circumstances," he says, "which create or effect a change of domicile in a commercial sense, would not necessarily do so in the wider sense in which the term domicile is generally used." We cannot find any indication in the subsection which we have quoted that the technical word "domiciled" is used in any but its strict legal signification. On the contrary, the express provision made for the cases of a debtor ordinarily residing, or having a dwelling-house or place of business, in England seems to exclude the popular construction of the word. [See *Ex parte Cunningham*, reported in another column.]

Accurate and practical as Mr. Ribton's notes undoubtedly are, they seem to us to err somewhat on the side of excessive caution. He may, perhaps, consider it outside the scope of an editor's duties to suggest difficulties, or hazard conjectural interpretations; but in one instance, at all events, we should have expected to find a more courageous treatment of the subject. Section 125, which introduces an entirely new procedure, and forms, as it were, a point of contact between chancery and bankruptcy practice, relates to the administration of the estate of a deceased insolvent. Mr. Ribton is eminently qualified to assist the reader in the difficulties likely to arise under this section, but he unfortunately leaves it without any explanatory note.

**THE PRINCIPLES OF BANKRUPTCY: EMBODYING THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883; PART OF THE DEBTORS ACT, 1869; THE BANKRUPTCY APPEALS (COUNTY COURTS) ACT, 1884, &c. By RICHARD RINGWOOD, Barrister-at-Law. THIRD EDITION. Stevens & Haynes.**

This excellent summary of the law of bankruptcy is clearly written and well arranged. It professes to be a manual for students, not a work for practitioners; and is accordingly not overlaid with references to cases. The fact that it has reached a third edition is the most satisfactory proof of its excellence as a text-book; and we may mention that the Council of the Institute of Chartered Accountants recognized the merits of the former edition by recommending it to the candidates for their examinations. The rules are printed in *extenso*, and the index is full and, in general, well constructed.

## THE NEW PRACTICE.

R. S. C., 1883, ORD. 55, R. 2, SUB-SECTION 2—BUSINESS IN CHAMBERS IN CHANCERY DIVISION.—In a case of *In re Wilkinson*, before Pearson, J., on the 14th inst., an application was made by petition for the payment out to the persons entitled of money which had been paid into court by a public body for the purchase of land which they were authorized to take under their statutory powers. It was objected on behalf of the public body that the application should have been made by summons in chambers, on the ground that there had already been an order made in the matter declaring the rights of the parties. PEARSON, J., held that the order which was relied on for this purpose was not one declaring the rights of the parties, and that, consequently, the sum in question being above £1,000, the application was rightly made by petition. His lordship added that to a great extent the new rules are very useful. They enabled the judge to decide in chambers a great many small matters. But he was quite satisfied that it was never the intention of the framers of the rules that the judge should take into chambers all the business which was formerly disposed of in court, without the assistance of counsel, and with great risk of money being paid to the wrong person.—COUNSEL, *Sturges & B. Eyre & Baylis*. SOLICITORS, *Harris, Wilkinson, & Raikes; Wilkinson & Howlett; E. A. Baylis*.

## PRACTICE APPEALS.\*

(Before FIELD and MANISTY, JJ.)

June 17.—*Bursill v. Tanner*.

In an action where judgment had been recovered against a married woman for the price of goods sold and delivered prior to the 1st of January, 1883,

Held, that separate estate acquired by her after the date of the contract was liable to execution, but that execution should be limited to such separate estate as the defendant was not restrained from anticipating.

*Pike v. Fitzgibbon* (L. R. 17 Ch. D. 454) considered.

Appeal from an order of Pearson, J., dated the 4th of June, giving the plaintiff liberty to sign final judgment, under order 14, for £50, the price of goods supplied to the defendant, a married woman, before the 45 & 46 Vict. c. 75 (Married Women's Property Act, 1882) came into operation. It appeared that the plaintiff had sold the goods to the defendant with a knowledge that she was a married woman, but upon the credit of her separate estate. By the order of Pearson, J., it was directed that execution should be limited to such separate estate.

*Manuel Jones*, for the defendant.—The order is wrong in subjecting the defendant's separate estate generally to execution. It should be limited to the separate estate which she could alienate at the time of the contract: *Pike v. Fitzgibbon* (L. R. 17 Ch. D. 454). [FIELD, J.—Sub-section 4 of section 2 of the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, repeals the law as there laid down.] The contract was entered into before the Act came into operation, and the latter ought not to be given a retrospective effect. The case of *The Gloucestershire Banking Company v. Phillips* (L. R. 12 Q. B. D. 533) is not an authority for holding so. In that case the question was one of procedure; here substantial rights and status are involved. [FIELD, J.—I do not think the point decided in the case mentioned was one of procedure; it was, as in this case, a question of liability.]

*Longstaffe*, for the plaintiff, argued that the effect of the Act of 1882 was to render the separate estate generally liable to execution in the first instance. Under section 19, such property as the defendant might possess without power of anticipation would still be protected.

The Court varied the order appealed against, and directed that execution should only issue against that portion of the separate estate of the defendant, in respect of which she was not restrained from anticipation, unless such restraint should exist under any settlement, or agreement for settlement, of her own property made or entered into by herself.

Appeal allowed, without costs.

Solicitor for the plaintiff, *Longstaffe*.

Solicitors for the defendant, *Freshfields*.

## BANKRUPTCY CASES.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

IN BANKRUPTCY.

(Before MATHEW, CAVE, and DAY, JJ.)

June 18.—*In re Wemyss, Ex parte Wemyss*.†

Jurisdiction of court—Power to rescind receiving order—Withdrawal of petition.

In this case, which was an appeal from a decision of Wynne Poulkes, Esq., judge of the county court of Cheshire, holden at Birkenhead, the question arose whether the court had jurisdiction to allow the withdrawal of a debtor's petition, and to rescind a receiving order. The debtor had filed his petition, and the usual receiving order was made upon it. Subsequently, but before adjudication, the father of the debtor, who was the principal creditor, paid off in full the other creditors, except one who was wholly secured. The debtor then, with the consent and support of his father and the secured creditor, applied to the county court for leave to withdraw his petition, and for an order to rescind the receiving order. The county court judge refused that application, on the ground that he had no jurisdiction to make it, but made an order staying all further proceedings under the petition. The debtor, being anxious to have the order in the form applied for, appealed from the judge's refusal.

*Linklater*, in support of the appeal, cited section 104 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, contending that it applied to all proceedings.

No one appeared for the official receiver.

MATHEW, J.—Really there can be no doubt here as to jurisdiction. The appeal must be allowed, as it is clear the court has the power to make the order asked for.

CAVE and DAY, JJ., concurred.

Appeal allowed, with costs.

Solicitors, *Pritchard, Englishfield, & Co.*

\* Reported by CHARLES CAGNEY, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

† Reported by J. GERARD LAING, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

## CASES OF THE WEEK.

**BANKRUPTCY PETITION—SCHEME OF ARRANGEMENT OF DEBTOR'S AFFAIRS—APPROVAL OF COURT—REASONABLENESS—DISCHARGE OF DEBTOR AT DISCRETION OF COMMITTEE OF INSPECTION—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883, ss. 13, 23, 44—BANKRUPTCY RULES, 1883, r. 165.**—In a case of *Ex parte Clark*, before the Court of Appeal on the 13th inst., an important question arose with regard to the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, as to schemes of arrangement of a debtor's affairs. The creditors of some traders who had presented a bankruptcy petition assented, in the mode prescribed by section 18 of the Act, to a scheme of arrangement of the debtors' affairs, which provided (*inter alia*) that the estate should vest in a trustee thereby appointed, and that the business of the debtors should be carried on under the direction of a committee of inspection consisting of three creditors. It was also resolved that the debtors should be discharged when the committee of inspection should so resolve. The debtors applied for an order approving the resolutions. The official receiver reported to the court that, having regard to section 23 of the Act, he had no reason to believe that the debtors had committed any misdemeanor under the Act, or part 2 of the Debtors Act, 1869, and that no facts had come to his knowledge which induced him to believe that the debtors had committed any of the offences referred to in sub-section 3 of section 28. But he submitted to the court that, as there is no provision in the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, by which creditors are empowered to suspend or grant the discharge of the debtor, such power ought not to be conferred upon the committee of inspection. Mr. Registrar Murray (*ante*, p. 548) came to the conclusion that the approval by the court of a scheme of arrangement under the 18th section was equivalent to a discharge to the debtor, and that, as the creditors had taken upon themselves to suspend the discharge, and to place the granting of it in the discretion of the committee of inspection, the resolutions were *ultra vires*, and the scheme could not be approved. The Court of Appeal (BAGGALLAT, COTTON, and LINDLEY, L.J.J.) affirmed the decision. Section 18 of the Act provides (*inter alia*) "(1) The creditors may at the first meeting or any adjournment thereof, by special resolution, resolve to entertain a proposal for a composition in satisfaction of the debts due to them from the debtor, or a proposal for a scheme of arrangement of the debtor's affairs. (2) The composition or scheme shall not be binding on the creditors unless it is confirmed by a resolution passed (by a majority in number representing three-fourths in value of all the creditors who have proved) at a subsequent meeting of the creditors, and is approved by the court. (5) The court shall, before approving a composition or scheme, hear a report of the official receiver as to the terms of the composition or scheme, and as to the conduct of the debtor, and any objections which may be made by or on behalf of any creditor. (6) If the court is of opinion that the terms of the composition or scheme are not reasonable, or are not calculated to benefit the general body of creditors, or in any case in which the court is required under this Act where the debtor is adjudged bankrupt to refuse his discharge, the court shall, or if any such facts are proved as would under this Act justify the court in refusing, qualifying, or suspending the debtor's discharge, the court may in its discretion, refuse to approve the composition or scheme. (8) A composition or scheme accepted and approved in pursuance of this section shall be binding on all the creditors, so far as relates to any debts due to them from the debtor and provable in bankruptcy. (13) 'Part 3 of this Act shall, so far as the nature of the case and the terms of the composition or scheme admit, apply thereto,' as if the trustee were a trustee in a bankruptcy, and as if the terms 'bankruptcy,' 'bankrupt,' and 'order of adjudication,' included, respectively, a composition or scheme of arrangement, a compounding or arranging debtor, and an order approving the composition or scheme. By section 44 (2), which is in part 3 of the Act, 'The property of the bankrupt divisible among his creditors shall comprise the following particulars' (*inter alia*)—'all such property as may belong to or be vested in the bankrupt at the commencement of the bankruptcy, or may be acquired by or devolve on him before his discharge.' Rule 163 of the Bankruptcy Rules, 1883, provides that 'when a composition or scheme is sanctioned, the official receiver shall forthwith put the debtor (or, as the case may be, the trustee under the composition or scheme) into possession of the debtor's property. The court shall also rescind the receiving order.' BAGGALLAT, L.J., said that section 18 contained no reference to any order of discharge of the debtor in the case of a composition or a scheme of arrangement. The provisions as to the order of discharge in the case of a bankruptcy were contained in section 28, which was not in part 3 of the Act. His lordship thought that, by the aid of sub-section 13 of section 18, section 44, in the case of a scheme of arrangement, should be read as if the words 'date of the order approving the scheme' were substituted for 'commencement of the bankruptcy.' It appeared to contemplate the discharge as possibly occurring at a period subsequent to the commencement of the scheme, and that any property accruing to the debtor before that period would be distributable among the creditors. This seemed to be the only way in which a discharge was at all in the contemplation of the Legislature with reference to section 18. Then, what was the effect of the approval of the scheme by the court? It appeared to him that, when once the court had given its approval, the proceedings in bankruptcy were at an end, and this, of course, ought to be taken into consideration before the approval was given. Section 18 contained provisions for giving effect to the composition or scheme; but, with that exception, the bankruptcy proceedings were at an end and the receiving order was to be rescinded. It was, therefore, very important that the court should see what was the precise nature of the scheme before giving its approval. In the present case the only objection taken was to the power

given to the committee of inspection as to the release or discharge of the debtors. His lordship was not prepared to say what would be the effect if the scheme contained no provision as to the time when the discharge of the debtor should be given. Speaking offhand, he was disposed to think that the approval of the court would be equivalent to the discharge of the debtor. Nor was it necessary to express any opinion how the case would have stood if some fixed future time had been appointed for the discharge of the debtors, or if it had been made to depend on some act of the debtors themselves when they should get their discharge. His impression was that the court would not consider such a provision unreasonable. But in the present case the granting of the discharge was simply left in the discretion of the committee of inspection. His lordship thought that this was a provision of an unreasonable character, and on this ground that the registrar was right in deciding that the scheme ought not to be sanctioned by the court. CORROX, L.J., was of the same opinion. The question was whether the scheme was reasonable. He was of opinion that no scheme would be reasonable which was not contemplated by the Act, which was contrary to the intention of the Legislature as expressed in the Act. Of course, there might be other grounds on which a scheme might be unreasonable. It was contended that the effect of the provision as to the discharge was merely to give the after-acquired property of the debtors to the creditors. That, however, was not the objection. His lordship was of opinion that a provision that the debtor should assign his after-acquired property to the trustee would be valid. But section 6 provided that the court, in considering whether it would approve a scheme, should take into account the same matters as it would under section 28 with reference to the discharge of a bankrupt. The court was to have a control over the question whether the debtor was a person who ought to have a discharge. Under the present scheme it was possible that, without any fault of the debtors, they might never get a discharge at all. The granting of the discharge was made to depend, not on the discretion of the court, but on that of persons to whom the Act had given no such discretion. In his lordship's opinion that was not such a scheme as was contemplated by section 18. He thought that what was contemplated was that the creditors should give the debtor a discharge either immediately or at some definite time, subject, of course, to the approval of the court. They had no power to delegate to other persons the decision when a discharge should be granted, so that it was possible that a discharge might never be granted at all. His lordship thought that this was not such a scheme as was contemplated by section 18. LINDLEY, L.J., concurred. He said that the case was one of importance—a test case. He felt very much embarrassed as to what the effect of the provision as to the discharge would be, but he thought it was not consistent with the general scheme of the Act.—COUNSEL, *Sidney Woolf; Bigham, Q.C., and Chalmers*. SOLICITORS, *Gush, Phillips, & Walters; W. W. Aldridge*.

**METROPOLIS LOCAL MANAGEMENT ACT, 1855 (18 & 19 VICT. c. 120), s. 96—VESTING OF STREET IN LOCAL BOARD—MEANING OF "STREET"—TELEPHONE WIRES ABOVE STREET—CONSENT OF LOCAL BOARD—INJUNCTION.**—In the case of *The Board of Works for the Wandsworth District v. The United Telephone Company (Limited)*, before the Court of Appeal, No. 1, on the 12th inst., the question was as to the right of a telephone company to suspend their wires over a street, being a highway, without the consent of the authority in whom the street was vested. The defendants had erected for a private person in Putney a telephone wire, the wire and the necessary apparatus being the property of the company and maintained by them. At one place the wire passes over the High-street of Putney, at a height from the ground of about thirty feet, being fastened to chimneys. By the Metropolis Management Act, 1855, all streets being highways in the Wandsworth district are vested in the plaintiffs, and under their management and control. The present action was brought for an injunction to restrain the defendants from retaining the wire, without the plaintiffs' consent, in the position in which it was placed. It was first contended that the defendants were a company subject to section 12 of the Telegraph Act, 1863, and were forbidden to place a telegraph over, or along, or across a street or public road, except with the consent of the body having the control of it. In the second place, the plaintiffs said that, as owners of the soil, they had an absolute right to prevent the defendants from suspending wires over their road, upon the principle that the air above the road was as much theirs as the road itself. Lastly, it was said that the wire was, in fact, a nuisance to the road, exposing the persons using it to danger. The case was tried before Stephen, J., who decided in favour of the plaintiffs. His lordship was of opinion that Parliament intended to give to the district board proprietary rights over the street, including in that word a certain space upwards as well as downwards, in order that the board might form a judgment as to the expediency on public grounds of permitting or refusing to permit various acts which, without being actual nuisances in such a sense as to be indictable, might nevertheless be regarded as undesirable innovations. Wires, he said, might be multiplied to any extent, and might collectively constitute a very appreciable nuisance. His lordship was against the plaintiffs on the other point, and found that the wire caused no appreciable danger to the highway, and was not an indictable nuisance. The defendants appealed. The court (BARR, M.R., and BOWEN and FRY, L.J.J.) allowed the appeal. BARR, M.R., said that the solution of the question depended upon the construction of the statute giving powers to the local board. Whatever those powers might be, there could be no doubt that if it had been shown that the wire was a nuisance and interfered with the proper use of the street as a street, then the plaintiffs would be entitled to an injunction, whether the wire was within the street or not. But the learned judge had found that there was no appreciable danger from the wire. It could not be said that the wire interfered with



the traffic of the street; and, therefore, there was no ground on which the claim for an injunction could be maintained, unless the mere fact of putting up the wire was a trespass upon the property of the board. His lordship understood the learned judge to have decided upon the ground that there was such a trespass, and that the plaintiffs were entitled to an injunction whether they were injured or not. The board had no rights except under the Metropolis Management Act, 1855, an Act which had been considered by the Court of Appeal in *Rolls v. Vestry of St. George the Martyr, Southwark* (28 W. R. 866, L. R. 14 Ch. D. 785). The Act says that all "streets" shall "vest in and be under the management and control of the district board." The questions in that case were as to the meaning of the words "street" and "vest in." Their meaning had been previously considered by the Court of Appeal in *Coverdale v. Charlton* (27 W. R. 457, L. R. 4 Q. B. D. 104). His lordship's view in that case was that the word "vest" passed the property in whatever was the subject-matter to be dealt with, so as to enable the local board to do what any owner might do, so far as any one other than the public was concerned—i.e., without infringing their duty to keep the street as a street. In the subsequent case, the Court of Appeal decided that the right only existed as long as the thing was a street. The question then arose as to the meaning of the word "street." It was suggested that it was only a right of way, or the mere surface, but the court held that the street went below the real surface. That was the basis of the judgment. The judgment of Lord Bramwell seemed to show that, with regard to depth, the property passed in what was called by Fry, L.J., "the area of ordinary user"—that is, such user as is ordinarily needed for the works done in a street. The judgments of Cotton, L.J., and himself did not differ, and the groundwork of the judgment of the court as to depth, at all events, was that in the statute in question in which the word "street" was used, and the word "land" was not used, the word "street" must receive the popular meaning at the date of the Act—viz., the width between houses—and that as regarded depth, "street" meant that which contains the area of ordinary user existing at the date of the Act. That judgment gave the principle to be applied in the present case to something above the surface. His lordship was not going to question that which had been laid down by Lord Coke, that a conveyance of "land" in terms passes everything which is covered by that land down to the centre of the earth, and *usque ad celum*. But it did not follow that the same would be conveyed where the grant is by the word "street." It seemed logically to follow that those who came to the conclusion that the word "street" included that which below the surface is within the ordinary area of user of the street must also hold that the same rule applies to that which is above the surface, and that it includes that area of air which is the area of ordinary user of the street as a street. Applying that rule, it could not be said that to walk along the tops of the chimneys to which the wires were affixed was an ordinary user of the street as a street. The statute did not pass property over the street, but only in the street. Therefore, no property passed in that part of the air in which the wires were placed, which, in ordinary language, were wires placed over, but not in, a street. Stephen, J., had construed the word "street" too largely. To the argument that the wire could not be put up without the leave of the board, it was an attempt to apply the interpretation of a particular phrase in a statute to a different phrase in another statute incorporated with the first. The case was within the principle laid down in *Coverdale v. Charlton*, and the wires were not placed upon property of the plaintiffs, so that an injunction could be granted on the ground of trespass. BOWEN, L.J., gave judgment to the same effect. FRY, L.J., said that the definition of "street" given in *Coverdale v. Charlton* was binding on the court. In considering the meaning of street, it was evident that there was a certain area which was ordinarily used for the purposes of a street. That included the surface of the street, and a somewhat undefined area above and below the street, and the whole was called the area of ordinary user. But it was apparent that both above and below there was an area in which interference might take place with the street. Stephen, J., although he had proceeded upon right lines, had erred in applying the case of *Coverdale v. Charlton*, and, intending to follow that case, had extended the area vested in the board so as to make it include the area of possible interference.—COUNSEL, Webster, Q.C., Cozens-Hardy, Q.C., and Moulton, for the appellants; Philbrick, Q.C., T. L. Wilkinson, and Lane, for the respondents. SOLICITORS, Waterhouse, Winterbotham, & Harrison; Correllis, Son, & Mossop.

**BANKRUPTCY PETITION—DOMICIL OF DEBTOR—ONUS OF PROOF—OFFICER IN BRITISH ARMY SERVING ABROAD—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883, s. 6, SUB-SECTION 1 (b).**—In a case of *Ex parte Cunningham*, before the Court of Appeal on the 13th inst., a question arose on the construction of section 6 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, which provides that a creditor shall not be entitled to present a bankruptcy petition against a debtor unless (*inter alia*), sub-section 1 (d), "the debtor is domiciled in England, or, within a year before the date of the presentation of the petition, has ordinarily resided or had a dwelling-house or place of business in England." In the present case the debtor did not come within the latter part of the sub-section, but the question was whether he was domiciled in England. He was an Irishman by birth, but he was an officer in the Royal Engineers, and was in command of the Royal Engineers in Guernsey, where he had an official residence in which he resided. The petitioning creditor's debt was due on a final judgment recovered against the debtor in England, and the act of bankruptcy was the failure of the debtor to comply with a bankruptcy notice which had been served on him in Guernsey. It was contended, on behalf of the petitioning creditor, that an officer in the British Army, whatever his domicile of origin, is necessarily domiciled in England, at any rate when he is on active service. And reliance was placed on cases relating to what has been called "Anglo-Indian"

domicil—cases in which it has been held that an officer residing in India in the military service of the East India Company acquired an "Anglo-Indian" domicile. The court (BAGGALLAY, COTTON, and LINDLEY, L.J.J.) held that the bankruptcy petition could not be sustained. BAGGALLAY, L.J., thought that the burden was on the petitioning creditor to show that the debtor's domicile was in England. There might, of course, be such an amount of *prima facie* evidence as to shift the burden to the respondent. In the present case, the only evidence was that the respondent bore a name which might be the name either of a subject of her Majesty or of an American, and that he held a commission in the military service of the Queen. That he might do if his domicile was either Scotch or Irish. The mere fact that he was an officer in the British Army, and bore a British name, was not sufficient. The argument was that the mere fact that a man was serving the Queen in her army made his domicile English, though his domicile of origin had been either Scotch or Irish. The rules as to domicile applicable to cases of the kind might be arranged under three heads—(1) a subject of the Queen entering into the naval or military service of a foreign Sovereign acquired the domicile of the country of that Sovereign; (2) a subject of the Queen entering into her naval or military service did not thereby lose his domicile of origin, which might be English, or Scotch, or Irish; (3) in the case of a subject of the Queen entering into the service of the East India Company, it had been held that an Anglo-Indian domicile had been acquired. This class of case could hardly arise now, because the separate government of the East India Company was now at an end, and the Indian Army was the army of the Queen. The cases of Anglo-Indian domicile were anomalous, and perhaps they rather depended on the notion that the East India Company was a quasi-foreign power. The second rule was applicable to the present case. The respondent by entering the military service of the Queen had not forfeited his Irish domicile of origin. The petitioner had not established that his domicile was English, and, therefore, the petition had been properly dismissed by the registrar. COTTON, L.J., agreed that the *onus* of proof was on the petitioning creditor, though there might be cases in which the *onus* would be shifted. The domicile referred to in section 6 was a domicile in England, as distinguished from Scotland or Ireland as well as foreign countries, because Scotland and Ireland had their own legal tribunals. No doubt, if a foreigner entered the British Army and resided in England, his domicile would be English. But was there in the present case any *prima facie* presumption that the debtor's domicile was English? The cases as to Anglo-Indian domicile did not depend on the fact of entering the service of the East India Company, but on residence in India under circumstances which showed that the person intended to abandon his domicile of origin because he was residing in India under circumstances which rendered it his duty to remain there permanently. When a Scotchman entered the British Army, he did not by so doing acquire a different domicile. His residence in England, or wherever he might be stationed, was merely temporary; it was merely for the purpose of discharging his military duty. The point was really decided in *Yelverton v. Yelverton* (1 S. & T. 574). The case was quite different from that of an Englishman or a Scotchman entering into the Russian or Dutch military service. In that case, the person so doing acquired a Russian or Dutch domicile, not from the mere fact of his entering the service, but from his going to reside in Russia or Holland under circumstances which would require his permanent residence there. LINDLEY, L.J., concurred. He thought that the law on this question of domicile was correctly stated by Mr. Dicey in his book on the Law of Domicile (p. 139):—"A soldier or sailor in the service of his own Sovereign retains the domicile which he had on entering the service, wherever he may be stationed." This statement was borne out by *Yelverton v. Yelverton* and *Brown v. Smith* (15 Beav. 444), which cases his lordship thought were rightly decided.—COUNSEL, Lyon; Sidney Woolf. SOLICITORS, C. R. Keale; Lewis & Lewis.

**JUDGMENT FOR ACCOUNT—IMPEACHING SETTLED ACCOUNTS—FRAUD—BUILDING SOCIETY.**—In a case of *Helgate v. Shutt*, before the Court of Appeal on the 18th inst., a question arose as to impeaching settled accounts. The action was brought by members of a building society against the secretary of the society (who was also a member), claiming to have an account taken of all moneys of the society come to the hands of the defendant, and for payment of the amount of such moneys. The plaintiffs also claimed the appointment of a receiver. Upon a motion afterwards made by the plaintiffs, Bacon, V.C., ordered the defendant to pay into court, to the credit of the action, a sum of £358 which was in his hands as trustee for the society. The order also directed the appointment of a receiver, and that an account should be taken of all moneys and property of the society come to the hands of the defendant, or of any other person or persons by his order or for his use. The defendant paid the £358 into court, and carried in an account in chambers. The plaintiffs claimed to surcharge him with certain sums which they alleged that he had received for the society and had not accounted for. The rules of the society contained a provision that the books of the secretary and treasurer should be audited every twelve months by auditors appointed by the society, and signed by the auditors to denote the accuracy of the secretary's book. "After such auditing and signing the secretary and treasurer shall not be answerable for any mistakes, omissions, or errors that may be found in such accounts hereinafter." The plaintiffs applied to the Vice-Chancellor for an order that, in taking the account which had been directed to be taken, the audited accounts of the society referred to in the rules might be disregarded. The Vice-Chancellor dismissed the application, expressing an opinion that the plaintiffs could not go behind any audited accounts, and that the rules must be treated as a contract

between the members of the society, and binding upon them. The Court of Appeal (BAGGALLAY, COTTON, and LINDEY, L.JJ.) were of opinion that the audited accounts were not binding in the case of fraud, but that they were *prima facie* binding, and that it lay on the plaintiffs to make out their allegations of fraud in a proper application in chambers. The present application was wrong in form, and the Vice-Chancellor was right in refusing it, for the audited accounts could not be disregarded. But the order should be prefaced with a declaration that, though the audited accounts were *prima facie* evidence in the defendant's favour, the plaintiffs were at liberty to impeach them, on the ground of fraud, if they could make out such a case on a proper application in chambers.—COUNSEL, *Miller, Q.C., and Farwell; Marten, Q.C., and Hamilton Humphreys*. SOLICITORS, *Pritchard, Englefield, & Co.; Johnson & Weatheralls*.

**BANKRUPTCY PETITION—COMPOSITION—APPROVAL OF COURT—REASONABLENESS—BANKRUPTCY BROUGHT ON BY RASH AND HAZARDOUS SPECULATION—RETROSPECTIVE EFFECT OF ACT—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883, ss. 18, 28.**—In a case of *Ex parte Rogers*, before a Queen's Bench Divisional Court on the 18th inst., a question arose as to giving the approval of the court to a composition which had been accepted by the proper majority of the creditors of a debtor. The debtor's statement of affairs showed that his liabilities amounted to £92,000, and his assets to £14,500. The creditors resolved to accept a composition of 3s. 6d. in the pound, of which 2s. was to be paid in cash within ten days from the approval of the court, and the remainder in three instalments of 6d. each at six, twelve, and twenty-four months after the approval. The official receiver, in his report, afterwards made, pointed out that proofs had been made only to the amount of £75,900, and that anything falling short of the amount of indebtedness on which the composition was based must be a clear profit to the debtor. The receiver also said that it was assumed that all the proofs were good upon the debtor's own statement, and without such an investigation as would take place by a trustee and a committee of inspection. The judge of the Liverpool county court declined to give the approval of the court to the composition. His Honour held that the composition was not reasonable and for the benefit of the creditors, on the ground (*inter alia*) that the proofs had not been inquired into, and that if they were strictly inquired into some of them might not be sustained. The judge also held that the bankruptcy had been brought on by rash and hazardous speculation, and that therefore, having regard to section 28, in connection with sub-section 6 of section 18, he ought to refuse to approve of the composition. The Divisional Court (MATHEW, CAVE, and DAY, JJ.) affirmed the decision. MATHEW, J., said that the case illustrated very clearly the difference between the old bankruptcy procedure and the new, greatly, he thought, to the advantage of the new. His lordship agreed that the fact that the question of reasonableness mainly concerned the creditors ought to be borne in mind. But it was the duty of the judge to satisfy himself, and he was not bound to adopt the conclusion of the creditors. He had, in the exercise of his judicial discretion, come to a different conclusion, and his lordship, even if he had had doubts as to the correctness of the decision (which he had not), should have had much hesitation in differing from it. His lordship also agreed that the debtor had been guilty of rash and hazardous speculation. CAVE, J., was of the same opinion. The judge must be satisfied of the reasonableness of the composition, and it necessarily followed that it was not enough that the creditors themselves had come to a conclusion in favour of it, though that was an element to be taken into consideration. The court must have regard to two points—the assets, and the creditors who would have to share in them. The judge had exercised his discretion, and this court ought to be satisfied that he was wrong before it overruled him. His lordship agreed that the proofs required investigation. Looking at all the circumstances of the case he thought that the county court judge would not have properly discharged his duty to those creditors who had not agreed to accept the composition if he had held that it was reasonable and calculated to benefit the general body of creditors.

With regard to the question of rash and hazardous speculations, the objection was taken that the *quasi*-penal provisions of section 28 are not retrospective—i.e., that they do not apply to acts done by a debtor before the Act came into operation. The Court, however, held that the provisions in question apply whenever the bankruptcy proceedings are commenced under the Act of 1883.—COUNSEL, *Mutholland; Chalmers*. SOLICITORS, *Whitley, Maddock, & Co., Liverpool; Solicitor to the Board of Trade*.

**ELEMENTARY EDUCATION—BOARD SCHOOL—"HOME LESSONS"—DETENTION OF CHILD AFTER SCHOOL HOURS.**—In the case of *Hunter, Appellant; Johnson, Respondent*, which came before the Queen's Bench Divisional Court (Mathew and Day, JJ.) on the 16th inst., the question arose as to the power of a schoolmaster of a board school to set "home lessons" to the children attending the school, and to keep them in school after school hours if they do not learn them at home. The respondent was the master of a Bradford board school, and the appellant was a child attending the school under the provisions of the Elementary Education Acts. The respondent gave the appellant certain lessons to learn at home, but the appellant's mother (who was also her guardian) wrote to the respondent protesting against it, and refused to allow the appellant to learn them. By a bye-law of the Bradford School Board, "the time during which every child shall attend school shall be the whole time for which the school shall be open for the instruction of children of a similar age." On the 20th of September, 1883, the appellant, who had been set "home lessons" to learn, came to school without having learnt them, and was kept in school after the ordinary school hours for children of a similar age. The appellant thereupon took out a summons, charging the respondent with an assault in

having kept the child in the school after school hours. The magistrates dismissed the summons, on the ground that there had been no assault, but expressed no opinion as to the legality of the "home lessons." Held, upon appeal, that neither under the Elementary Education Acts nor under the bye-laws had the respondent, the schoolmaster, any power to impose upon children the duty of learning "home lessons"; that this child had, therefore, been punished for disobedience to an order which the respondent had no power to enforce; and that the detention of the child in school after the ordinary school hours amounted in law to an assault. The magistrates, therefore, ought to have convicted the respondent.—SOLICITORS, *Indermaur & Brown*.

**DIVORCE—DECREE NISI—RESCINDING—MOTION BY PETITIONER—NOTICE TO RESPONDENT.**—In the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, on the 17th inst., in a suit of *Troward v. Troward*, a decree nisi was rescinded, on the application of the petitioner. The suit, which was brought by a wife, was heard on the 17th of November, 1883, before Butt, J., without a jury, and the court granted a decree nisi for a dissolution of marriage on the ground of the respondent's adultery and cruelty. The petitioner had since resumed cohabitation with her husband, and wished to have the decree rescinded. The respondent was not now represented. HANSEN, P., ordered that, upon an affidavit that notice of the present motion had been served upon the respondent, the decree nisi should be rescinded, and the petition dismissed.—COUNSEL, *Hopkins*. SOLICITORS, *Lewis & Lewis*.

## SOCIETIES.

### SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The twenty-fourth anniversary festival of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association was held on Wednesday, at the Star and Garter Hotel, Richmond, under the presidency of Sir THOMAS PAINE. Upwards of 100 guests sat down, including J. W. Mellor, Q.C., M.P.; Alderman Herbert J. Waterlow; Rev. John Lee; Samuel Lee; R. W. Wall; R. F. MacSwiney; A. H. Ruegg; F. T. Woolbert; J. Hart; J. K. Crossfield; G. F. Eland; G. H. Bower; J. Tarry; A. J. Wood; N. Hanhart; A. R. Gillman; E. T. Tadmán; J. G. Bristow; R. Quick; M. B. Dodds, M.A.; G. E. Steward; S. Hurry Asker, Norwich; Henry Attlee, London; Richard M. Beachcroft, London; William Frank Blandy, Reading; Henry P. Bowling, London; Arthur W. Brain, Southampton; Ebenezer J. Bristow, London; William Beriah Brook, London; H. Morten Cotton, London; Grantham R. Dodd, London; Joseph Dodds, M.P., Stockton-on-Tees; John A. Farnfield, London; Henry James Francis, London; George Godfrey, London; William Greaves, London; G. Cattell Greenway, Warwick; Archibald Hanbury, London; Edwin Hedger, London; Joseph E. S. King, London; Thomas Layton, London; Henry Lee, Whitechurch, Salop; Edwin Low, London; Robert Edmund Mellersh, Godalming; J. Vernon Musgrave, London; Edgar J. Paine, London; W. Benjamin Paterson, London; Richard Pennington, London; Richard Pidcock, Woolwich; Philip Rickman, Twickenham; Henry Roscoe, London; Herbert Tritton Sankey, Canterbury; Frederick E. Sawyer, Brighton; W. Edwood Shirley, Doncaster; Sidney Smith, London; Henry Sowton, London; Frederic William Steward, London; W. Melmoth Walters, London; Reginald Ward, London; G. Brash Wheeler, London; and James Thomas Scott, secretary.

The half-yearly report up till April last shows the increasing progress and usefulness of the association. Since the last report in October, 1883, 77 new members had been admitted, thereby increasing the aggregate number enrolled to 2,764, of whom 1,043 were life members, and 1,721 annual subscribers. Fifty of the life members were also annual contributors of from one to ten guineas each. The receipts from all sources during the half-year terminating on February 29, 1884, amounted to £2,027 18s. This, compared with the corresponding period of last year, shows satisfactory progress, and the board were glad to report a steady increase in the amount of regular subscriptions. During the same period of six months, the directors had awarded grants to those in need of assistance amounting to £1,140—viz., £430 in the relief of nine cases of members and their families (an average of nearly £48), and £710 among fifty cases of non-members and their families (an average of about £14). The sum of £112 10s. was also paid in the half-year to annuitants, from the income of the late Miss Ellen Reardon's bequest, &c. The number of cases for relief presented to the board from non-members and their families was rapidly increasing, and every possible investigation was made into the merits of each application. The balance, at the Union Bank of London on the 29th of February was £542 0s. 11d., of which £110 15s. 10d. pertained to the Reardon Trust Account, being the surplus of receipts over expenditure to date, liable to investment at the discretion of the directors; £15 was also in the hands of the secretary. A sum of £449 1s. 6d. Reduced Three per Cents. was purchased during the half-year, and the total funded capital of the association (including the Reardon Bequest) on the 29th of February amounted to £47,894 9s. 5d. The directors much regretted having to record the decease of three of their colleagues—viz., Mr. W. S. Allen, of Birmingham; Mr. James Crossley, of Manchester; and Mr. George Essell, of Rochester—in whose places they had elected Mr. Cornelius T. Saunders, Birmingham; Mr. W. Hodgkinson Guest, Manchester; and Mr. Henry Kitson, of Wolverhampton, to serve on the board.

The toast of "Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen" having been proposed from the CHAIR, and honoured with the customary enthusiasm,



The CHAIRMAN proposed the health of "His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, the Princess of Wales, and the other members of the Royal Family," remarking that the Prince of Wales performed a difficult task entirely to the satisfaction of everybody. His time and good-nature appeared to be at the service of every good cause, and the way in which he moved about from place to place in the performance of his duties was often a matter of astonishment. The Princess of Wales had become a household word of beauty and amiability, and he was sure all present would sympathize with the loss her Majesty had recently sustained by reason of the death of her youngest son, the late Duke of Albany.

The CHAIRMAN next gave "The Incorporated and other Law Societies in England and Wales." He felt some little difficulty about part of this toast, because he supposed that, as regarded the majority present, it was very much like drinking "our noble selves." Last year he had had the honour of responding to the toast in this very room. They were all, he believed, convinced that the society was one that was very useful to the profession, especially if, as he knew was now the case, it was well looked after by the profession themselves, and they were careful to choose the best men to serve on the council they could find. In coupling with the toast the name of his friend the present excellent president of the Incorporated Law Society, he did not know that he could say anything more, except that he would be a terror to all future presidents. He had given his time, his judgment, and his experience most unhesitatingly to the society during his year of office, and he (the chairman) could say from his little experience that he had never known a president who had done so much in this way. The other law societies were also extremely useful adjuncts to the main society, and he hoped they would long continue to act in their useful capacity. He would couple with this part of the toast the name of Mr. W. E. Shirley, of Doncaster, the vice-president of the Yorkshire Law Society.

Mr. BASTOW, in responding, observed that the toast was not so often proposed that it had lost any of its freshness or any of its value from frequency or repetition, and yet he ventured to think that the Incorporated Law Society was perhaps doing a work, and had been doing a work, which might entitle it to an occasional complimentary recognition such as they had paid it to-night. That compliment he was sure was all the more appreciated in that it had been paid by a company almost exclusively composed of members of the profession of which the Incorporated Law Society was the recognized head, and whose interests it was the especial object of the society to preserve and promote. The Incorporated Law Society had always endeavoured to be in the front in all the measures which had been taken with the object of improving the status of the profession. Those of them who had arrived at mature years, and who had made themselves acquainted with the literature of the stage, would know the estimation in which solicitors were formerly held. They would know that the favourite villain of the play was generally represented by some rascally limb of the law who was a gentleman by Act of Parliament, a solicitor of her Majesty's Court of Chancery, and the foiling of those wicked plans gave great interest to the piece. All this had been altered, and he could not help thinking that a great deal of the merit of this was due to the Incorporated Law Society. From time to time the Incorporated Law Society had taken a great deal of trouble with the mode in which the entrance to the profession was to be effected, and they had endeavoured to render it necessary that all those seeking to join the profession should have a certain amount of liberal education. They had also sought to encourage the would-be student by the establishment of a series of lectures, examinations, and classes, which were carried on not only in London but in the provinces, and after they had become solicitors the society watched with a good deal of anxious care lest the honour of the profession should be sullied by any unworthy conduct on the part of its members. Then they took a great deal of trouble with the current legislation, which was always shifting about—to such an extent, indeed, that many of the older members of the profession had to go to school again to keep pace with the times. It was very easy to talk about legal reforms, much easier than to see to all the details of such reforms and make them practicable; much easier to elaborate them on paper than to make them work. And he thought he might say that for many details which had concurred together to make recent legislation a success the Legislature had been indebted to the Incorporated Law Society, and to those kindred societies which had so ably assisted them and backed their efforts. In speaking as he had he had perhaps gone a little contrary to the line which the chairman had marked out for him. The chairman had thought it unnecessary that anything should be said in praise of the Incorporated Law Society, but now they would see that he (Mr. Bastow) had to point a moral. What he wanted to urge was that for all this service the Incorporated Law Society was entitled to a more general, and, he might say, a more generous, support than it at present received from the profession at large. Looking at the democratic tendency of the present times, which was so thoroughly subversive of all vested interests, the time was perhaps not far distant when it might be important that an united front should be shown in defence of their privileges. There was one privilege which no one could take from them, and that was the privilege that those who had been fairly successful in the profession might have in contributing to the assistance and support of those who in fighting the battle of life had been less fortunate. He concluded by earnestly appealing on behalf of the association, wishing it every success, and trusting that every one would go away with a firm determination to assist in helping the arrival of that happy time when every member of the profession should be a member of the Incorporated Law Society, and every member a subscriber to the Solicitors' Benevolent Association.

Mr. W. EDWOOD SHIRLEY (vice-president of the Yorkshire Law Society), responded on behalf of the provincial law societies, remarking that the

Yorkshire Law Society was no mushroom. Founded as it was in the year 1796, it had for nearly 100 years carried on a useful work and occupied an honoured position, and there was only one thing which tinged his memory with somewhat melancholy feelings at the present moment, and that was the recollection of those who had occupied the position which he occupied to-night. If he were in Yorkshire he might mention some whose names were perhaps not unknown even beyond the confines of their own county. He meant such men as Mr. Gray and Mr. Richardson. He would mention another whose name he held in honour, and who was an intimate friend from his very boyhood until his death—he meant George Leman. Although these were gone, they had, happily, yet some amongst them who were held in high honour. He could only mention one more whom he saw at that table to-night; that was the honourable member for Stockton-on-Tees, Mr. Dodds. He had said the Yorkshire Society had been in existence for nearly 100 years. He had often thought what a wonderful thing it would be to go to sleep for 100 years, and wake up and see what changes had taken place. Let them fancy a man who had gone to sleep when the Yorkshire Society was first formed. At that time George III. was king; there were no railways, no telegraphs, no steam, no gas, and in the whole world not a single postage stamp. Then let them think of all the laws which had been turned upside down in the rage for what was called improvement, and which rage had not yet been satisfied. All he could say was that he hoped the future would be equal to the past. They were lawyers, and, as such, were considered fair game anywhere. He recollected hearing of a deaf old chaplain who was asked to say grace, and, just before, someone had said there had been great mortality amongst lawyers. He did not hear the observation, and said, "For these and other mercies the Lord be thanked." What was the object of their various societies? To promote good feeling, good brotherhood, and honourable practice amongst those with whom they came into contact; and he agreed with the last speaker in hoping that a time would come when every member of the profession would be a member of the Incorporated Law Society. He was one of those who thought the subscription was too high, and that it ought to be reduced. It would be an excellent thing if every member of the profession were not only a member of the Incorporated Law Society of London, but also of the local society of the neighbourhood in which he lived.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the toast of the evening, "The Solicitors' Benevolent Association, and may prosperity continue to attend it." He said they had met together to drink prosperity to the society, but they were also met for the purpose of doing something more for the interest and benefit of the society. They were met with the best possible intention to contribute to the funds of a most deserving charity, and he thought the whole case might be stated in two questions and their answers. He should assume it to be the duty of all those who were able to do so to provide for the less fortunate of their brethren. Could there be a form of charity which really was more beneficial and more kind, and which was more useful than that devoted to the relief of the necessities of those who had fallen from a better sphere, and who felt the pressure of poverty much more severely than was the case with those who had been accustomed to it in early days? If this change was hard enough for a young family reduced from a position of comparative affluence to beggary, how much harder was it for the widow and the daughter arrived at a certain age whose spring and elasticity were gone, and who had nothing to live for. Here was a case where help from the society would be an untold blessing. The next question was, "Is the society a worthy one?" He thought that could be answered very satisfactorily and in a very few words. The society was but twenty-six years old. It had managed to accumulate a fund of nearly £50,000, and had given away £28,000 altogether in benefactions. During the last year it had given away £3,000. It had an income consisting of about that amount, one-half of which was derived from subscriptions, and the other half from invested funds. He was sure that in the hands of the gentlemen who were good enough to devote their time and judgment to the way in which the funds were distributed the best use was made of them. He wished to add that a very well-known member of the profession who declined, for some reason best known to himself, to become an annual subscriber, had that morning sent him a cheque for £100, this being the third donation of a like amount which he had given. He referred to their excellent friend, Mr. John Hollams.

The toast was drunk upstanding and with three cheers.

Mr. W. BERNARD BROOKE (chairman of the board) gave "The Chairman of the Evening." A very few observations were necessary to commend this toast to them, but he might say that Sir Thomas Paine was an old member of the association; he might call him an original member, and he believed he became a member either in the year in which it was originated or in the following year. A very strong opinion had been expressed at the provincial meetings of the association to the effect that on the occasion of their annual festival they should be presided over by one of their own body. He (Mr. Brooke) thoroughly approved of that, and he assumed that most present held the same opinion. They seemed to have come to the conclusion that if they could not get one of their own body to preside at these annual gatherings they had better give them up altogether. On this occasion they had had the pleasure of having Sir Thomas Paine in the chair, who was always ready to assist the association.

The health was drunk amidst cheering.

The CHAIRMAN having briefly responded,

The SECRETARY (Mr. J. T. Scott) read the list of donations which amounted in all to £790. Amongst the sums given were twenty-one guineas from the chairman, and £100 from Mr. Hollams, already referred to.

Mr. W. MELMOTH WALTERS next gave the health of "The Visitors," which was responded to by Mr. Alderman HERBERT J. WATERLOW, and the proceedings terminated.

During the evening a selection of music was performed by Mr. Lester, Mr. Coates, Mr. Albert James, Mr. De Lacy, and Mr. Hilton, Mr. J. Turle Lee presiding at the pianoforte.

#### GLOUCESTERSHIRE AND WILTSHIRE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The first annual meeting of this society as recently incorporated, being the sixty-eighth annual general meeting of the original society hitherto known as the Gloucestershire Law Society, was held at the Plough Hotel, Cheltenham, on the 11th inst.

Mr. Ellett (Cirencester), the president of the society, was in the chair.

There was a large attendance of members, including Mr. W. F. Rogers (Tetbury), vice-president; Mr. M. F. Carter (Newnham), Mr. R. S. Helps (Gloucester), Mr. W. S. Jones (Malmesbury), Mr. H. Kinner (Swindon), Mr. G. B. Smith (Nailsworth), Mr. T. Taynton (Gloucester), Mr. G. Whitcombe (Gloucester), Mr. Mullings (Cirencester), Mr. C. F. Gale (Cheltenham), Mr. E. C. Sewell (Cirencester), Mr. Warman (Stroud), Mr. James B. Winterbotham (Cheltenham), Mr. E. W. Coren (Gloucester), hon. secretary, &c., &c.

The report of the committee, as previously circulated, was received and adopted.

Mr. C. F. Gale, of Cheltenham, was elected vice-president for the year.

Donations to the amount of £90 to the widows and children of deceased solicitors were voted. Seventeen new members were elected, and the next annual meeting was fixed to be held at Swindon.

A discussion took place on a motion made by Mr. W. S. Jones, of Malmesbury, as to the proper practice with reference to the preparation of appointments in view of settlements on marriage. The facts of the case under consideration were these:—The father and mother of the intended husband made an appointment in his favour to enable him to bring the appointed sum into settlement, and the solicitors for the intended wife claimed to prepare this appointment. The solicitors for the intended husband were also the solicitors for his father and mother, the appointors. The meeting was unanimously of opinion that it was the right and duty of the solicitors for the father and mother to prepare the appointment.

After the meeting the members dined together under the presidency of Mr. W. H. Gwinnett, J.P., who is now the father of the society, having been a member upwards of fifty years, and for many years in practice as a solicitor at Cheltenham.

#### LAWYERS IN SEARCH OF A DESIGNATION.

THE *Scottish Journal of Jurisprudence* states that a meeting of the Glasgow Faculty of Procurators was recently held in the Faculty Hall—Dr. Anderson Kirkwood, in the absence of the Dean (Mr. C. D. Donald), in the chair.

Mr. J. B. Fleming submitted the following motion:—"That this faculty do now take into consideration the propriety of recommending the members of the legal profession in Glasgow who are members of this faculty to abandon the custom of designing themselves 'writers,' and that they do hereafter design themselves as 'solicitors.'" In support of the motion, he said any proposition of this sort might be held to be such as should more properly emanate from the council of the Faculty. The council had, he believed, had the matter under consideration, and various suggestions had been made for adopting some initials distinguishing regular practitioners. F.P. was proposed, but was considered too suggestive of fire plugs, and no set of initials seemed to commend itself. It seemed, however, that if they were to wait till the council brought the matter before the Faculty they should have to wait a very long time, and though not a matter of the gravest urgency, still it was one upon which it might be well to get an expression of opinion. There were very few, he was sure, in the profession who had not found some practical anomalies arising from the use of the obsolete, but not time-honoured, name of writer. For himself, he knew he found the inconvenience so great that he had to have resort to two sets of calling cards—one with writer on it for use in Scotland, and another with solicitor for use forth of Scotland. It would have been more appropriate to have spelt the word "writer" as "righter;" for, he took it, however far they might fall short in their endeavours, they did endeavour to do right, and their duty certainly was to right the wrongs of their clients, and in that sense they were righters. However, he need not take up time pleading for a mere change in the spelling of the word, particularly considering that while their own clients believed implicitly, let them hope, in their doing right, there was always another set of fellows believing as implicitly that they were doing wrong, and that they were the most injured innocents in creation. It seemed to him the arguments against the continuance of the use of the name were simply innumerable, and he knew not what arguments could be used in favour of it except that it is, and whatever is right, or in this case it might perhaps be put even more strongly—whatever is writer. No doubt it had local use and wont in its favour, and no doubt also it was Scottish. He had endeavoured to find out if it had any antiquarian, archæological, historical, or literary merits to commend it, but he could find none. In literature the word was generally to be found preceded by the libellous adjective drunken; and followed by the scarcely less objectionable noun "body."—"A wee bit drunken writer body,"—and Burns, confessing his sins, says,—

"I've been at drunken writers' feasts."

He should not doubt that writer is the modern form of scribe, and therefore had antiquity on its side. That might be to some extent true, but it was by no means a respectable antiquity. Scribes, according to the very highest authority, had the very worst associates. He defied any one almost to say scribes without saying Scribes and Pharisees—hypocrites. Scribe led to skriever, described in the Scottish dictionaries as an inferior sort of writer—a mean scribe. It led also to scribbler and scrivener, and here seemed to find as little favour as writer:—

"The scrivener Luscus, now with pride elate,  
With incense fumed, and big with robes of state."

That, he supposed, could only now be held to apply to town clerks, but with small burghs springing up all over the place we had a goodly supply of town clerks. We had also an ancient divine speaking of "a pestilent band of libertine scribblers," and Dryden,—

"How happy in his low degree,  
Who leads a quiet country life,  
And from the gripping scrivener free."

No one seemed to have a good word to say for either writers or scribes or scriveners. An argument that was generally used for the retention of the name writer was that it was Scottish. He believed he was just as patriotic as any member of this Faculty, but he failed to see that that in itself was an argument. While it was desirable to preserve all that was Scottish that had a meaning, he saw no use in preserving what was utterly meaningless, and what throughout Scotland itself was not generally being preserved. In Edinburgh they had, of course, writers to the Signet. That had a meaning, and was worthy of preservation. The other practitioners were the solicitors before the Supreme Courts. That also had a meaning, and would no doubt be kept up. The state of affairs in Scotland, leaving out Edinburgh, therefore, stood thus:—Solicitors, 11; procurators, 7; procurators and solicitors, 6; advocates, 1; law agents, 1. The preponderance thus already appeared to be in favour of solicitor. He could quite understand that thirty, forty, or fifty years ago, when the intercourse with England was infinitely less than it now is, that the name writer, while even then possessing nothing to commend it, possessed little to discommend it; but now-a-days it is very different, and, independent of England altogether, what did their own clients call them? Not writers certainly. Did any one ever hear one Glasgow merchant saying to another, "Well, at last I had to put the matter into the hands of my writer, or my writers." Each and every one, however Scottish he might be in theory, would, in practical, everyday life, say, "I put the matter into the hands of my solicitor, or solicitors." Their English brethren had very sensibly copied from them in some things, such as the appointment of a public prosecutor, and they in Scotland might do well to follow suit and copy them in other things, such as the adoption of the name solicitor by those whose own clients talk of as their solicitors. With regard to the name solicitor as the best substitute for the name writer, he did not know that he could defend it against all comers as abstractly the most suitable, but he could certainly defend it on the ground of simple common-sense. There was no doubt that it would be universally understood, from Land's End to John o' Groat's, which writer was not. Since the passing of the English Judicature Act in 1873, the name solicitor had been applied to all persons practising before the courts at Westminster, and throughout England "solicitor" was thoroughly understood. In Scotland, as he had shown, it was already largely adopted; in the United States of America and our own colonies it was in universal use. Mr. Fleming then moved the adoption of the motion that stood in his name.

Mr. George Black seconded the motion.

Mr. David Murray moved a negative to Mr. Fleming's motion. It seemed to him that neither on the grounds of principle nor expediency had he shown any good cause for the change that he advocated. A solicitor was one who solicited, not business from clients, but the intervention of the Court of Chancery, just as technically a bill is still solicited in Parliament. According to Mr. Fleming, "writer" was a new word; "solicitor" one of ancient standing and respectability. He disputed both propositions. Solicitor was a word of recent origin, and was not later than the sixteenth century. The concurrent word in England was attorney-at-law—a term as old as the Conquest. An attorney-at-law, as distinguished from an attorney in fact, was one deputed to appear or act for another in a suit before a court of law, and precisely corresponded with the Scottish expression "law agent," which had recently been sanctioned by the Legislature. Originally solicitors were clerks in the office of the six Clerks of Chancery, who, doing business on their own account for the outside public, as well as performing their official duties, gradually gave up the latter, and devoted themselves entirely to acting as agents for others. That was the origin of the solicitors. The only ground that Mr. Fleming could suggest why we should adopt the name "solicitor" was, that some unfortunate Scottish writer was kept standing for half-an-hour in the ante-chamber of an English brother, who mistook him for a text-writer in a law stationer's office. If we were to correct every blunder of ignorant Englishmen, we should never end, and might as well swamp our country and institutions *en bloc* at once. The Legislature had dubbed them law agents, which, although not a very high-sounding title, was at least descriptive and accurate. Their friends on the south of the Tweed seemed to have a hankering after it, and not to be altogether set upon their own word solicitor, as in the Acts 1875, 1876, and 1877 they flourished under the title of "legal practitioners." Coming next to the despised word "writer," Mr. Murray said that it was an old name in Scotland—a title of great antiquity, and one which he hoped would flourish for many a day. If Englishmen did not understand it, so much the worse for them. That was no reason why we should alter it. It was a much more ancient name



than even "attorney." Mr. Fleming had said quite rightly that at one time it meant scribe. Quite true, but it was not the scribe that he referred to—not the gentleman who associated with the Pharisees. The *scriba* was an officer in the Roman courts. He was an officer of the courts that succeeded these throughout the Middle Ages, and in our own country we had the *Scriba curie*. Translated into the vernacular, this was the writer, or the writer of court—not the man of quill pen and flourishes, a stroker of "i's" and a dotter of "t's," but what we would now call the registrar, or what the French call *greffier*. While we had writers in court, they, like the clerks of the Court of Chancery, to whom he had before referred, began to do outside business, and "writer" came to be a general expression for a legal practitioner. A notary had certain duties to perform, well known and well defined. A procurator was a court practitioner, so was an advocate. A writer, taking the analogy of the English scrivener, might be supposed to be limited to a conveyancer, but in practice this was not so, and the word simply meant a lawyer, not an advocate, practising all or any of the branches of the law. In Edinburgh they had Writers to the Signet, but Writers to the Signet was not their correct designation. They were properly clerks to the Signet. When the Court of Session was instituted, they were clerks in the office of the Secretary of State, whose successor is the Keeper of the Signet. Their sole and proper duty was to prepare such writs as required to pass the Signet. They had nothing whatever to do with court practice. Indeed, at that time the advocate did everything on his own account. He performed the duties both of counsel and agent. The clerks to the Signet had gradually extended their duties from the Signet Office and became legal practitioners in general, and as a branch of that business had taken up agency in the Court of Session. When they did so the old expression "clerk to the Signet" became somewhat inappropriate, and they consequently took the name that was in general use, viz., "writer," and added to it the words "to the Signet," and so blossomed into W.S. The other writers who were practising before the court as agents had a hard time of it. They were always being shouldered out by the W.S. or some other person, and had to make a stout fight for it. They at last, in the year 1797, obtained a royal charter incorporating them and giving them a legal standing. They could not conveniently take a name embracing the word "writer," as the clerks to the Signet had forestalled them. They had therefore to cast about for another, and no happy mortal having suggested "law agents," they hit upon "solicitor," and became solicitors before the Supreme Court. They took this name very much, however, to show that they had nothing to do with the rather supercilious writers to the Signet, who had persecuted them many years before, and continued to do so for many years after this time. That was the way that solicitor was first used in this country. Of course, there was the word "attorney," but this was not open to them, as the old Court of Exchequer was still in existence, and when that institution was imported from the South they had not only barons and chief barons, but a "clerk of the pipe," and full-fledged attorneys. This was why their friends became solicitors and not attorneys. Fifteen years after the solicitors-at-law had their charter, the procurators got theirs. Their predecessors would have nothing to do with the term "solicitor"; they called themselves by the old name "procurator." On all these grounds there was, he held, no cause whatever to alter the old and well-known designation, and so far from solicitor being a word generally understood, very few in country districts knew what it was. He accordingly moved a negative to Mr. Fleming's motion.

Mr. Lauchlan Cowan seconded the amendment.

The amendment was carried by a considerable majority.

Afterwards, on the motion of Mr. James Mackenzie, a committee was appointed to consider the propriety of members of the Faculty adopting some special name or initials to distinguish them from other members of the profession not belonging to the Faculty.

## OBITUARY.

### MR. CHARLES BEAVAN.

Mr. Charles Beavan, for many years an official examiner of the Court of Chancery, died at his residence, 91, St. Mary's-road, Pimlico, on the 18th inst., in his eightieth year. Mr. Beavan was born in 1805, and was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1829. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1830, and practised for many years in the Chancery Division. Mr. Beavan will be remembered as one of the last of the old generation of law reporters. He published a long series of reports of the decisions in the Rolls Court of Lords Langdale and Romilly. On the establishment of the *Law Reports* he declined to make arrangements with the Council of Law Reporting, and continued his reports until his appointment by the late Lord Romilly as an official examiner of the Court of Chancery. He filled that position until a few months ago, being the last holder of the office. Mr. Beavan was a bencher of the Middle Temple.

### MR. WILLIAM EDWARD HILLIARD.

Mr. William Edward Hilliard, barrister, died suddenly at his residence, Cowley House, near Uxbridge, on the 20th ult. Mr. Hilliard was the second son of Mr. Nash Crozier Hilliard, solicitor. He was born in 1823, and he was educated at the Merchant Taylors' School. He was admitted a solicitor about the year 1846, and he formerly practised in Gray's-inn, being for several years at the head of the firm of Hilliard, Dale, &

Stretton. He retired from business about twenty-one years ago, and he was called to the bar at Gray's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1866, but he had never practised as a barrister. Mr. Hilliard was a director of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, and of several other companies, and he was lord of the manor of Cowley Peachey. He formerly commanded the Uxbridge Volunteer Rifle Corps, and he was subsequently major in the 7th Battalion Middlesex Volunteers. He was married to his cousin, the daughter of the Rev. Francis Hilliard, but he leaves no family. Mr. Hilliard was buried at Cowley Church on the 24th ult.

### MR. THOMAS THORPE DELASAUX.

Mr. Thomas Thorpe Delasaux, solicitor, died at Canterbury, on the 21st ult., in his eighty-seventh year. Mr. Delasaux was of Huguenot extraction. He was the son of Alderman Delasaux, of Canterbury, and was born in 1797. He was articled to Mr. Sandys, of Canterbury, and he was admitted a solicitor in 1820. Shortly after his admission he was elected coroner for the Eastern Division of the county of Kent. He had thus held the office for sixty-four years, and he was the oldest coroner in England. He was also for many years coroner for the city of Canterbury, and he is stated to have held 4,000 inquests. In 1870 he was presented with a handsome testimonial from his professional and other friends, in commemoration of the day of his fiftieth year of office as coroner. Mr. Delasaux was also formerly clerk to the Herne Bay Improvement Commissioners. He had been twice married, and he leaves three sons and three daughters. He was buried at Harbledown on the 27th ult.

## LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. EDWARD TALFOURD HUGHES, solicitor, of 2, Gresham-buildings, Basinghall-street, and of Woolwich and Plumstead, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. HAROLD CHAMBERLIN, solicitor, of Yarmouth, has been appointed Solicitor to the Lowestoft Steam Carrying Company.

Sir THOMAS CHAMBERS, Q.C., M.P., recorder of the City of London, has been appointed Steward of the Borough of Southwark, in succession to Mr. William John Payne, deceased.

Mr. SAMUEL FREDERICK LANGHAM, solicitor, of 10, Bartlett's-buildings, coroner for the Duchy of Lancaster, and deputy-coroner for the City of London, has been elected Coroner for the City of London and the Borough of Southwark, in succession to Mr. William John Payne, deceased.

Mr. EDMUND FREEMAN, solicitor, of 17, Knight-riders-street, has been appointed Solicitor to the Second Legal Building Society. Mr. Freeman was admitted a solicitor in 1881.

Mr. ALFRED WILLIAM RAWLINSON, solicitor, of Horsham and Crawley, has been appointed Clerk to the Horsham School Board, on the resignation of his partner, Mr. Arthur Reid Bostock. Mr. Rawlinson was admitted a solicitor in 1873.

Mr. JOHN OSTELL, solicitor (of the firm of Donald & Ostell), of Carlisle, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. W. H. JAMIESON, solicitor, of the Outer Temple, 222-225, Strand London, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. REGINALD MACKENZIE MERCER, solicitor, of Canterbury, has been elected Coroner for that city, in succession to Mr. Thomas Thorpe Delasaux, deceased. Mr. Mercer was admitted a solicitor in 1878.

### DISSOLUTIONS OF PARTNERSHIPS, &c.

EDWARD ST. GEORGE WOLSELEY and CHARLES DEARMER BROWNING, solicitors, 151, Edgware-road, Middlesex. May 27.

[Gazette, June 13.]

## LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK.

### HOUSE OF LORDS.

June 13.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

PRIVATE BILLS.—London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway; Metropolitan Railway (Various Powers); Eastern and Midland Railway; Southwark and Vauxhall Water; Sutton-bridge Docks; West Lancashire Railway (Extensions); Metropolitan District Railway.

*Bills Read a Third Time.*

PRIVATE BILLS.—Hallett's Estate; Hull, Barnsley, and West Riding Junction Railway and Dock.

June 16.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

**PRIVATE BILLS.**—Earl of Aylesford's Estates; Winwick Rectory; Porthdinleyn Railway; Bank of South Australia; Halifax High Level and North and South Junction Railways.  
Royal Military Asylum Chelsea (Transfer).

*Bills Read a Third Time.*

**PRIVATE BILLS.**—Ruthin and Cerrig-y-Druoidion Railway; Manchester Ship Canal; Wharves and Warehouses Steam Power and Hydraulic Pressure Company.

June 17.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

**PRIVATE BILLS.**—Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway; Blackpool Railway; London and South-Western and Metropolitan District Railway Companies; Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway (Additional Powers); Great Western Railway (No. 2); Lancashire and Yorkshire and London and North-Western Railway Companies (Preston and Wyre Railway); Dore and Chinley Railway; Liverpool, Southport, and Preston Junction Railway; East London Railway; Great Southern and Western Railway (Tulrow Extension); London (City) and Southwark Subway; London Street Tramways; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway; London and North-Western Railway; Great Southern and Western Railway (Additional Powers); Brighton Improvement; Bristol Corporation (Docks Purchases).

Cruelty to Animals Acts Amendment (No. 2).  
Hyde Park Corner (New Streets).

*Bill in Committee.*

Great Seal.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

June 12.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

Consolidated Fund (No. 2).  
Settled Land.

*Bill in Committee.*

National Debt.

*Bill Read a Third Time.*

**PRIVATE BILL.**—Manchester, Bury, and Rochdale Tramways (Extension).

June 13.—*Bills in Committee.*

Representation of the People.  
National Debt.

*New Bill.*

Bill to extend section 41 of the Licensing Act, 1872 (Mr. ARNOLD).

June 16.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

**PRIVATE BILLS.**—Clacton-on-Sea Special Drainage District; Coventry and District Tramways; Liskeard and Caradon Railway; Malvern Hills; Neath Harbour; Stockton and Middlesbrough Corporations Water; Walton-on-the-Naze and Frinton Improvement; York Extension and Improvement.

*Bills in Committee.*

National Debt.

Fisheries (Oyster, Crab, and Lobster) Act, (1877) Amendment.

*Bills Read a Third Time.*

**PRIVATE BILLS.**—Medina (Isle of Wight) Subway; Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway Ventilators); Metropolitan Board of Works (Various Powers); Anglesey and Camarvon Direct Railway; Chatham and Brompton Tramways; Cranbrook and Paddock Wood Railway; Great Western Railway (No. 1); Mersey Railway; North London Tramways; Taft Vale Railway; Treferig Valley Railway; Woolwich Equitable Gas.

Consolidated Fund (No. 2).

*New Bill.*

Bill to amend the law relating to patronage, simony, and the exchange of benefices in the Church of England (Mr. STANHOPE).

June 17.—*Bill Read a Second Time.*

**PRIVATE BILL.**—Wright's Patent.

*Bill in Committee.*

Representation of the People.

*Bills Read a Third Time.*

**PRIVATE BILLS.**—North Metropolitan Tramways; Metropolitan (Lewisham, Greenwich, and District Tramways).

June 18.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

Church Patronage.  
Church Patronage (No. 2).

*New Bill.*

Bill to enable local authorities to transfer the whole or certain parts of their districts for the purposes of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878, to the districts of neighbouring local authorities (Mr. HASTINGS).

## THE NEW CIRCUIT ARRANGEMENTS.

In the House of Commons, on Monday, Mr. ARNOLD asked the Attorney-General whether he could then state any particulars of the scheme for the sittings of the judges of the High Court of Judicature, and especially with reference to Lancashire.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said:—I am now in a position to answer the question of the hon. member, and to state the arrangements which have now been made for the purpose of effecting a saving of judicial time. We found that there was a very strong feeling, both in the country and in the House, against depriving any county of assizes, and consequently we do not propose to introduce any legislation for that purpose. The assizes will therefore continue in every county and also for every town as heretofore, with the exception of Kingston-on-Thames, the business of which will be transferred to Guildford and Croydon, the remaining assize towns. The effect of this will be to provide continuous sittings in London, and to secure the better administration of justice in the counties. There are seven circuits in England and two in Wales, and upon those circuits there are fifty-four different towns at which assizes are held. At all those towns in England two judges have always attended, however little work there may have been to do. Under the new arrangement, to all of those towns one judge only will be sent instead of two, with the exception of thirteen towns. To those remaining thirteen—namely, Durham, York, Leeds, Exeter, Bristol, Winchester, Stafford, Nottingham, Lincoln, Derby, Warwick, Chester, and Swansea—two judges will be sent. In cases where two judges may be required in the other towns, to meet that demand an additional judge will be sent from London. The result of this will be that in the early part of the circuit nine judges will be sent, and in the latter part ten, and those judges will be taken exclusively from the Queen's Bench Division. The Courts of Appeal will thus be able to hold their sittings continuously, as also will the Chancery, Divorce, and Admiralty Courts. Special provision has been made for the county of Lancaster. There will be assizes held at Manchester and Liverpool under exceptional circumstances, the circuits commencing on the 15th of February, the 15th of June, the 25th of October, and also a fourth circuit for dealing with criminal cases. Provision has been made for the sitting of the judge until his list is disposed of, so that there shall be no *remnants*. Provision has also been made for a judge—I presume he will be an equity judge—attending at Manchester and Liverpool for the purpose of trying equity cases.

Sir R. CROSS.—Will the equity judge form part of the Lancashire Court?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—No; the judge will be a judge of the High Court. With regard to the question of local centres, great difficulty has been experienced, but arrangements have been made for assizes to be held at Birmingham twice a year, which will be considered as partly on the Oxford and partly on the Midland Circuit. I believe the new arrangement will accomplish what was desired, and at the same time tend in the direction of economy.

Sir R. CROSS.—I presume we are to understand that two judges will go to Manchester and Liverpool. I should like also to inquire whether any further arrangement has been made for the trial of admiralty cases in the county of Lancaster.

Mr. S. HILL.—At what time, in relation to that held at Stafford and Warwick, is it proposed to hold the Birmingham assize?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—In the reply to the right hon. gentleman I may say that it is intended to send two judges to Manchester and Liverpool. I will make inquiries with regard to the admiralty cases. In answer to my hon. and learned friend, who, I presume, asks his question in the interest of the Oxford Circuit, I may say that it is proposed that Birmingham shall be taken as the last town after all the towns on the Oxford Circuit and all the towns on the Midland Circuit. It will be considered a town belonging to both circuits.

Mr. TOMLINSON asked whether it was proposed that the new sittings should go on concurrently with the chancery jurisdiction of the Palatine Courts.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—I know of no intention to deal with the jurisdiction of the Palatine Courts. As I have ready said, this scheme is only one of a tentative character.

In answer to Sir M. Ridley,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL stated that the time allotted to Newcastle would be eight days.

In answer to Mr. BAITAN,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said.—Leeds will remain as it is at present. There is no additional jurisdiction given in respect to that town.

Sir R. CROSS.—My hon. and learned friend will, I hope, lay a copy of the Order in Council upon the table.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—It will be laid on the table as soon as possible.

Mr. HICKS inquired whether any rearrangements would be made with regard to the spring and autumn circuits in view of a better distribution of judicial labour in the different counties.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—I may remind the hon. member that at the spring and autumn assizes criminal cases alone are taken.

In answer to Mr. WARTON,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said it was not intended that in future there should be a commission day. The necessary formalities might occupy about an hour on the first day.

The following is a complete list of the places and dates of the circuits for the ensuing summer assizes, as rearranged by the judges, viz.:—Lord Chief Justice Coleridge will go alone to Salisbury on July 9; Dorchester, July 12; Wells, July 16; Bodmin, July 22. He will be joined at Exeter

Mr. Charles A. Bannister, who was mentioned by our reporter last week as being present at the dinner of the United Law Clerks' Society, was prevented from attending by a bereavement.

June 21, 1884.

by Mr. Ju  
to Bristol  
Justice Fic  
Mr. Justice  
July 16; J  
ford, Aug  
to Reading  
July 11;  
24. He w  
and at th  
return to  
be a new  
dleston an  
bury on J  
July 8; O  
by Mr. Ju  
on July 19  
of the busi  
and Mr. Ju  
The Wels  
Newtown  
July 19; F  
August 2.  
Cardigan,  
July 24; C  
be at Lanc  
John Mr. Ju  
together to  
Justice Ma  
and Mr. Ju  
at Liverpool  
at the above  
days before

Monday, Ju  
Tuesday ...  
Wednesday ...  
Thursday ...  
Friday ...  
Saturday ...

Monday, Ju  
Tuesday ...  
Wednesday ...  
Thursday ...  
Friday ...  
Saturday ...

APPEALS  
DIVORCE  
DIVORCE  
COURTS.

Brown v Mar  
la re Russell  
Dec 31  
la re The Fl  
app of Co

Gud v Comm  
Kay Jan  
la re The Sw  
Mr Justice  
la re W Jones  
la re The Fl  
app of Co  
la re J B R  
Rogers from  
Gandy v Red  
Weller v Stor  
la re Elizabeth  
Hause) N  
on Feb 1  
lybbe v Hart  
la re Branfo  
app of Mar  
Guthrie v H  
Pulchett v H



by Mr. Justice Field on July 24, and both judges will afterwards proceed to Bristol, July 29, and Winchester, August 4. Previously to this, Mr. Justice Field will go to Maidstone on July 9, and Guildford on July 16. Mr. Justice Denman will go alone to Cambridge on July 10; Huntingdon, July 16; Bury, July 18; Norwich, July 23; Chelmsford, July 29; Hertford, August 2; and Lewes, August 5. Mr. Baron Pollock will go alone to Reading on June 30; Oxford, July 3; Shrewsbury, July 7; Hereford, July 11; Monmouth, July 14; Gloucester, July 17; Worcester, July 24. He will be joined at Stafford on July 29 by Mr. Baron Huddleston, and at the conclusion of the business there Mr. Baron Pollock will return to town. The business will commence at Birmingham, which will be a new assize town, on August 2, the judges being Mr. Baron Huddleston and Mr. Justice Lopes. Mr. Justice Smith will go alone to Aylesbury on June 30; Bedford, July 3; Northampton, July 5; Leicester, July 8; Oakham, July 14. He will be joined at Nottingham, on July 15, by Mr. Justice Lopes, and they will further proceed together to Lincoln on July 19; Derby, July 24; and Warwick, July 29. At the conclusion of the business at the latter place, Mr. Justice Smith will return to town, and Mr. Justice Lopes will join Mr. Baron Huddleston at Birmingham. The Welsh circuits remain unaltered. Mr. Justice Grove will go to Newtown on July 11; Dolgelly, July 14; Carnarvon, July 16; Beaumaris, July 19; Ruthin, July 22; Mold, July 24; Chester, July 26; Swansea, August 2. Mr. Justice Stephen will go to Haverfordwest on July 11; Cardigan, July 15; Carmarthen, July 18; Brecon, July 22; Presteigne, July 24; Chester, July 26; Swansea, August 2. Mr. Justice Mathew will be at Lancaster on July 9; Appleby, July 11; Carlisle, July 14. He will join Mr. Justice Manisty at Durham on July 17, and they will proceed together to York, July 24, and Leeds, July 29. Previously to this Mr. Justice Manisty will go alone to Newcastle on July 7. Mr. Justice Cave and Mr. Justice Day will hold the assizes at Manchester on July 14, and at Liverpool on July 26. Both civil and criminal business will be taken at the above places. We understand that causes are to be entered seven days before the date for holding each assize.

## COURT PAPERS.

### SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

#### ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	V. O. BACON.	Mr. Justice KAY.
Monday, June .....	23 Mr. King	Mr. Ward	Mr. Lavie
Tuesday .....	24 Merivale	Pemberton	Pugh
Wednesday .....	25 King	Ward	Lavie
Thursday .....	26 Merivale	Pemberton	Pugh
Friday .....	27 King	Ward	Lavie
Saturday .....	28 Merivale	Pemberton	Pugh
Mr. Justice CHITTY.			
Monday, June .....	23 Mr. Toedale	Mr. Koe	Mr. Jackson
Tuesday .....	24 Farrer	Clowes	Carrington
Wednesday .....	25 Toedale	Koe	Jackson
Thursday .....	26 Farrer	Clowes	Carrington
Friday .....	27 Toedale	Koe	Jackson
Saturday .....	28 Farrer	Clowes	Carrington

## COURT OF APPEAL.

### TRINITY SITTINGS, 1884.

#### APPEALS FOR HEARING.

(Set down to Wednesday, 4th June, inclusive.)

APPEALS FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

(Concluded from p. 584.)

*Rown v Marriot* appl of pltt from Mr Justice North Dec 29  
*In re Russell*, deod *Russell v Schoolbred* appl of defts from Mr Justice Kay Dec 31  
*In re The Florence Land and Public Works Co Ltd and Co's Acts* (Nicol's case) appl of Co and Official Liqr from Mr Justice Chitty Dec 31  
 1884.  
*Gard v Commissioners of Sewers for City of London* appl of defts from Mr Justice Kay Jan 4  
*In re The Swiss Unwashed Milk Co and Co's Acts* appl of A H Bacon from Mr Justice Chitty Jan 7  
*In re W Jones*, deod, *Jones v Jones* appl of B Jones from Mr Justice Fry Jan 16  
*In re The Florence Land and Public Works Co (Infant and Pensonby's case)* appl of Co and Official Liquidator from Mr Justice Chitty Jan 17  
*In re J B Rogers Electric Light and Power Co, Ltd, and Co's Acts* appl of J B Rogers from V C Bacon Jan 21  
*Gandy v Reddaway* appl of pltt from Mr Justice Pearson Jan 26  
*Weller v Stone* appl of defts from Mr Justice Denman for Justice North Jan 29  
*In re Elizabeth May*, deod, residuary legatee of John May, deod (ex pte Charles Home) Natl Debt Act, 1870 appl of pttne (C H Home) from Mr Justice Pearson Feb 1  
*Lybbe v Hart* appl of deft from Mr Justice Chitty Feb 4  
*In re Branford*, deod, *Branford v Blake*, *Blake v Vincent*, *Branford v Branford* appl of Mary B Branford from pt of judgt of Mr Justice Kay Feb 6  
*Sheldahl v Oddy* appl of pltt from Mr Justice Pearson Feb 6  
*Patchett v Illingworth* appl of deft Thomas Illingworth from V C Bacon Feb 8

*McAndrew v The Indian Mammoth Gold Mines, Ltd, and ors* appl of defts H M I F Fitzmaurice and ors from pt of judgt of Mr Justice Chitty Feb 11  
*In re C V W Bedson's Trusts* in favour of W J Bedson and Children, and 10 & 11 Vict appl of A S G Bedson and anr from Mr Justice Pearson Feb 12  
*In re Contract for Sale of Real Estate between Emily Hill and Charles E Hill as vendors and Allen Chapman as purchaser* (V and P Act, 1874) appl of Emily Hill & anr from Mr Justice Pearson Feb 13  
*J M Luxmore & her Husband v J H Chambers & ors* (Philip Montagu and Wife intervening as plts) appl of plts from deces of Sir James Hanson Feb 13  
*In re John Perriam*, deod *Perriam v Perriam* appl of plts from Mr Justice Pearson Feb 14  
*Farrer v Lacy, Hartland & Co & ors* appl of deft Francis Day from Mr Justice North Feb 14  
*Edaile v Payne* appl of plts from Mr Justice Kay Feb 15  
*In re Trusts of Will of R M Benson*, late of Bristol, tobaccoist appl of R C Benson and anr (trustees & executors) from refusal of V C Bacon in Chambers Feb 18  
*Truman v the L B and S C Ry Co* appl of defts from Mr Justice North Feb 18  
*Snelling v Pulling* appl of deft Richard Strong from Mr Justice Pearson Feb 19  
*In re Mason*, deod *Mason v Cattley* appl of deft E M Croese from Mr Justice Fry Feb 22  
*In re R Jones's Trade Mark and Trade Mark Registration Acts and opposition of Messrs H J Andrews and Co* appl of Robert Jones from Mr Justice Chitty Feb 23  
*In re Watson*, d-d *Watson v Watson* appl of pltt from V C Bacon Feb 26  
*Holyland v Lewin* appl of deft G F Lewin from part of judgment of Mr Justice Chitty Feb 26  
*In re C F De Roux*, deod *Rymer v De Roux* appl of J P Patman from Mr Justice North for Mr Justice Pearson Feb 29  
*In re Fitzroy Bessemer Steel Hematite Iron and Coal Co Ltd and Co's Acts* appl of S W Smith from Mr Justice Kay Feb 29  
*In re Viscount Exmouth*, deod *Viscount Exmouth v Pellow* appl of defts Pellow and Lane from Mr Justice Pearson Feb 29  
*Hitchmough v Alltree* appl of deft from Mr Justice Pearson Mar 4  
*In re J B Quick*, deod *Alken v Quick* appl of Royal Hospital for Incurables and other Charities Mar 5  
*In re National Arms and Ammunition Co Ltd and Co's Acts* appl of Mayor, &c of Birmingham from Mr Justice Chitty  
*In re the Same Co* appl of Overseers of Aston nigh Birmingham from Mr Justice Chitty Mar 6  
*In re Hy Cousins*, the elder, deod *In re Hy Cousins*, the younger, deod *Alexander v Cross* appl of defts S S Cross and ors from V C Bacon Mar 6  
*Bowness v Archibald* appl of deft from V C Bacon Mar 7  
*Phillips v Phillips* appl of deft from V C Bacon Mar 12  
*In re The Cape Breton Co Ltd and Co's Acts* (section 65) appl of the Rt Hon G A F Cavendish Bentinck, M.P., from Mr Justice Pearson Mar 17  
*In re The Russell's Will Trusts*, and *In re Trust of Mary Hadworth's Legacy and Trustee Relief Act, 10 & 11 Vict c 96* appl of Jane Ferguson, widow, from Mr Justice Kay Mar 17  
*In re Garnett*, deod *Gandy v Macaulay* appl of plts from V C Bacon Mar 17  
*In re Garnett*, deod *Gandy v Macaulay* appl of Geo Garnett Orms and Wife from V C Bacon Mar 19  
*McDonnell v Copestake* appl of pltt from order of Mr Justice Kay on fur con and summe to vary Mar 19  
*Wallis v Watson* appl of pltt from Mr Justice Denman for Mr Justice North Mar 20  
*In re Gilbert*, deod, *Gilbert v Huddleston* appl of deft Huddleston and anr from Mr Justice Kay March 21  
*Bolemore v Watson* appl of deft Peter Watson and anr from Mr Justice Pearson March 22  
*Nixon v Sheldon*, *Sheldon v Nixon* appl of pltt from Mr Justice Pearson March 24  
*In re Clay*, deod, *Clay v Clay* appl of Herbert S Clay and anr from Mr Justice Chitty March 25  
*Stibbard v Black* appl of deft from Mr Justice Kay March 27  
*In re Geo Emery's Trusts and H Emery's Trusts and 10 & 11 Vict c 96* appl of W H H Kelke and anr from refusal of Mr Justice Kay March 28  
*Ballard v Tomlinson* appl of pltt from Mr Justice Pearson March 29  
*Vint and Ux v Hudsphit*, *Vint and Ux v Hudsphit* and anr appl of plts from judgt of Baron Pollock from Mr Justice Pearson in both actions April 3  
*In re Contract for Sale of Real estate between R N Gaeville and C F D Gillard*, vendors, and G Sinnott, Purchaser, V & P Act, 1874 appl of George Sinnott and anr from Mr Justice Pearson April 3  
*The London Financial Association, Ltd, v Sir J Kelk and ors* appl of plts from V C Bacon April 7  
*Ward v Sharp* appl of pltt from Mr Justice North April 10  
*Marshall v Reynolds* appl of plts from V C Bacon April 10  
*Hall v Smith* appl of plts from Mr Justice Chitty April 10  
*Martinson v Clowes*, *Norwich and Norfolk, &c, Co v Martinson* appl of p't (using in forma pauperis) from Mr Justice North for Mr Justice Kay April 10  
*Ager v The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co* appl of defts from Mr Justice Kay April 10  
*Higgrave* (trading as Frank Higgrave & Co) v *Cox* appl of plts from judgt of V C Bacon April 18  
*Dodds v Take* appl of defts from order of V C Bacon on fur con April 19  
*In re J Swann*, deod *Blythe v Harrison* appl of defts from refusal of Mr Justice Pearson April 23  
*In re The Walmer Castle Public House, West Ham, Essex*, Settled by Will of John Hayle deod and Settled Land Act 1882 appl of Maria Hayle & anr from decision of Mr Justice Pearson against tenant for life April 25  
*In re The Price*, deod *Williams v Jenkins* appl of plts from order of Mr Justice Pearson on appl to vary chief clerk's certificate April 26  
*Robertson v Sharp* appl of pltt from judgment of Mr Justice North at trial May 1  
*In re Defries*, deod *Nordon v Defries* appl of p't from judgt of Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson May 2  
*Winstle v Ash* appl of deft T F Ash from judgt of Mr Justice North at trial May 2  
*Sawyer v Sawyer* appl of deft Jas Allwright from order of Mr Justice Chitty on fur con May 2  
*In re Jas Eldridge & ors* solrs of the Supreme Court and *In re Taxation of Costs* appl of Jas Eldridge & ors from order of V C Bacon at chambers May 3  
*In re The Cannock & Rugeley Colliery Co Ltd & Co's Acts 1862-1883 and In re Peake's Liquidation ex parte Peake & Fisher* appl of trustees in liquidation from order of V C Bacon May 2

Watson (on behalf of himself and other foreign Peruvian bondholders except dfts) v Cave Allen (on behalf of) v Cave (by original and supplemental orders) In re Chilean Government Debts Sir Henry W Taylor & ors (Trustees of Bondholders named in said Debts) v Rait & ors app of dft Geo Thos Rait from order of Mr Justice Chitty on far con May 6  
In re S McClellan, dead McClellan v McClellan app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Kay May 7  
Chancery Actn—Mr Justice Kay—1883—M—239 Moller v Thompson tried at Gloucester by Mr Justice Mathew, pursuant to order of the Queen's Bench Division dated 22nd June, 1883 app of dft from order of Mr Justice Mathew directing entry of stet process May 8 judgt of Mr Justice Kay May 7  
In re The Old Falstaff Club, ld, & Co's Acts app of Official Liquidator from refusal of Mr Justice Pearson May 9  
Midland Land and Investment Corporation v Saunders and ors app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Chitty May 14  
In re Bageall & Sons, ld, & Co's Acts app of Liquidator from judgt of Mr Justice Chitty on sums May 14  
In re F Pollock, dead Pollock v Worrall app of plit from order of Mr Justice Pearson May 14  
In re The Asphaltic Wood Pavement Co, ld app of Commissioners of Sewers of City of London from V C Bacon May 15  
Cavendish v Cavendish app of plit H F C Cavendish from Mr Justice Pearson May 19  
In re Thos Turner, dead Boynton v Tidy app of plts from V C Bacon May 20  
In re Geo Kerry, dead Ling v Gower app of dft Ann Gower, spinster, from Mr Justice Chitty May 20  
Pratt v Walsh (by claim and counter claim) app of dft from judgt of V C Bacon May 20  
Underhay v Smith app of dft C W Johnson and anr from order of Mr Justice Chitty on application to vary certificate May 19 Underhay v Smith app of dft H G Smith from same order May 20  
The Masters, &c, of the Clothworkers Co, London, v Hutchinsan app of dfts from judgt of V C Bacon at trial May 21  
Hunt v J T Hunt & Son, ld app of dft Co from judgt of Mr Justice Chitty May 22  
Price v The Bala and Festiniog Ry Co app of dft Co from judgt of Mr Justice Chitty at trial May 27  
Avalle v Wearing app of plit from judgt of Mr Justice Kay May 27  
Holt v Holt app of dft from order of Mr Justice Kay May 28  
In re The Great Holway Lead Co, ld app of P E Batcliffe from order of Mr Justice Chitty May 28  
The Grand Junction Canal Proprietors v The Regents Canal and Docks Ry Co app of plts from order of Mr Justice Kay May 28  
Williams v London and South Wales Coal Co, ld app of dfts from V C Bacon May 29  
In re The Bovine Cattle Spice Co, ld and Co's Acts app of the Co from winding up order of V C Bacon May 30  
In re The Florence Land and Public Works Co, ld app of Anglo Italian Bank from Mr Justice Chitty disallowing claim May 30  
In re George Alfred Cooke, one of Solicitors of Supreme Court app of G A Cooke from order of Mr Justice Kay striking off Rolls May 30

Appeals from the County Palatine Court of Lancaster.  
From Final Orders and Judgments.

1883.

Ritson v Harrison Harrison v Ritson app of dft-Rooke Pennington from the Vice-Chancellor June 30  
In re The International Marine Hydropathic Co, ld and Co's Acts and Lancaster Act, 1850—54 app of Official Liquidator from the Vice-Chancellor Sept 3  
Siddall v Townsend app of plit from part of judgt of the Vice-Chancellor Nov 19  
In re M A Gordon, dead Walsley v Rice app of dft T C Rice from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor Nov 23

1884.

The Official Liquidator of the Blackburn and District Benefit Building Society v Caniffe, Brooks, & Co app of dfts from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor Jan 7  
Parnell v Mort, Liddell & Co app of plit from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor Feb 22  
H E Moss & Co v Caird and anr app of dfts from order of the Vice-Chancellor and fur con and sums to vary Mar 6  
Falkner v Colquhoun app of dft William Colquhoun from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor Mar 27  
In re Bolton, dead Hulley v Bolton app of plit from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor Apr 7  
In re The Parton Hematite Iron Co and Co's Acts, ld and Lancaster Acts, 1850—54 app of John Russell and ors from refusal of the Vice-Chancellor to remove from List of Contributors Apr 24

From Interlocutory Order.  
(Procedure.)

Wright, an infant, and ors v Wright app of Joseph Wright (having leave to attend) from order of the Vice-Chancellor May 3  
N.B.—The County Palatine Appeals as the dates of setting down are reached in the General and Procedure Lists are set aside and taken on the first Thursday in every month during the Sitting of Appeal Court II.

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the Chancery Division.

Grafton & Co v Watson & Co app of dfts from Mr Justice Chitty March 25 (part heard May 14—present Lords Justices Baggallay, Cotton and Lindley)  
In re Adam Norris dead Allen v No ris app of plts from Mr Justice Fry—(S O March 21, 1883, with liberty to amend peto) restored by order  
In re B C Pullan a solr app of R Robinson from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty—restored after legacy paid set down August 2 1883  
Harvey v Lacey app of plit in person from Mr Justice Chitty April 16 (security for £20 ordered May 14)  
Jackson v Needle app of dft from V C Bacon April 16  
James Whalley dead Priestman v Thomas & ors (question of estoppel arising on the pleadings—Probate) app of dfts Charles Thomas and Edward Gunnell from decision of the President that dfts estopped from denying Will obtained by fraud April 27  
Taylor v The East Barnet Valley Local Board app of dfts from Mr Justice Chitty April 21  
Moller v Thompson app of dft from order of Mr Justice Kay dated December 21 directing terms at trial to be carried into effect Feb 21

Moller v Thompson app of dft from Mr Justice Kay dated April 9 refusing to discharge order of March 13 April 21  
Holgate & ors Members of No 2 King's Arms, &c, Building Society v Shutt app of plts from V C Bacon April 24  
Kennedy v Lyall app of dfts from V C Bacon May 1  
Sir R Hanson & ors v British Tea & Trading Assoc ld app of dft Co from V C Bacon May 6  
Chamberlain v Fiddy app of plts from Mr Justice Pearson May 6  
Griffith v Blake app of dfts from Mr Justice Chitty May 13  
Davies v Evans app of dft from V C Bacon May 14  
Lady Gertrude E Colin Campbell v Lord Colin Campbell (Divorce) app of Lord Colin Campbell from the President dismissing appln for new trial action tried by the President May 16  
Pearson v Pearson app of dft from Mr Justice Kay May 16  
Peruvian Guano Co, ld, v C Bockwoldt app of dfts Dreyfus Bros & Co from V C Bacon May 17  
Taylor v The Pilsen Joel and General Electric Light Co, ld app of plit from Mr Justice Pearson May 21 (transferred to separate list by order)  
Harvey v Harvey app of W H Willats, Sheriff of Kent, from Mr Justice Chitty May 22  
McClean v The Alexandra Newport and South Wales Docks and Ry Co app of dft from Mr Justice Kay May 27  
Kitching v Hewer app of dft Hewer from Mr Justice Chitty May 28  
Cain v Clegg appln for allowance of objections to taxation under order of Court of Appeal May 28 (set down in separate list by order)  
Palace Chambers, Westminster, Co, ld v London and Globe Telephone and Maintenance Co, ld app of dfts from Mr Justice Pearson May 29  
In re Nation, dead Nation v Hamilton app of plit from V C Bacon May 30  
Mackenzie v Morris app of plit from V C Bacon at chambers May 30  
In re T E Williamson, dead Williamson v Wright app of plit from refusal of V C Bacon May 31

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY (ADMIRALTY) DIVISIONS.

(Concluded from p. 485.)

Trenchard v Holdway app of plit from judgt of Justices Watkin Williams and Mathew on special case April 1  
Lister and anr v Horsfall (Hardaker and anr third parties) app of third parties from Justices Denman and Manisty directing payment by third parties of dfts costs of action April 1  
Sheffield and South Yorkshire Permanent Bldg Society v Harrison app of plit from judgt of Mr Justice Field after trial April 1  
White v Willoughby app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial in Middlesex April 2  
W H Last (Surveyor of Taxes) v The London Assurance Corp'n (Q B Revenue Side) app of W H Last from Mr Justice Day (Mr Justice A L Smith dissentiente) April 3  
Tew v Newbold-on-Avon School Board app of plit from judgt of Mr Justice A L Smith after trial April 3  
Tate & Sons v Hyslop app of plit from Justices Day and A L Smith setting aside verdict and judgt and giving judgt for dft—action tried in L'n on 1 by Mr Justice Manisty April 5  
F Blake (Surveyor of Taxes) v The Imperial Brazilian, Natal and Nova Cruz Ry Co ld (Q B Revenue Side) app of the Imperial Brazilian & Ry Co from offer of Justices Day and A L Smith April 8  
The Mayor &c of Over Darwen v The Justices of the Peace of Lancashire app of dfts from judgt of Justices Day and A L Smith on special case April 7  
Elliott v Bayly app of plit from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial in Middlesex April 7  
Findlay and the London Dry Docks Co ld v W Barter & Co and ors app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial April 9  
Pearson v Earl of Aylesford app of dft from order of Justices Denman and Manisty—action tried by Mr Justice Day in Middlesex April 10  
The Queen v T D Sibly (Q B Crown Side) app of J W Sealey and ors from the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Stephen and Lopes confirming order quashing Auditors' allowance April 17  
Hanley and anr v Stroud Water Co and ors app of dft Baker from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial April 18  
Milton v Partridge app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in London April 19  
Ship Vera Cruz (damage—claim for loss of life) Mary Seward v Owners of the Vera Cruz app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt April 21 (without assessors)  
Hallen v Gooles and ors app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice A L Smith at trial in Middlesex April 21  
Aspey v Jones app of plit from Justices Denman, Manisty, and Watkin Williams giving judgt for dft, with costs April 21  
Kahelby v Cooke & Sons app of plit from judgt of Lord Justice Baggallay at trial at Liverpool April 29  
National Bank of Wales, ld, v Thomas and ors app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew in Middlesex April 30  
The Societe Generale de Paris v The Tramways Union Co, lmd app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial at Liverpool May 2  
Felix and anr v Gordon app of plit from judgt of Mr Justice Hawkins with special direction as to costs at trial in Middlesex May 8  
Dinn v Cole app of plit from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial in Middlesex May 10  
22 & 23 Vict. c. 85, s. 10 Booth v Smith app of plit from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial May 20  
Ship Horace—Owners of Historian and ors v Owners of Horace her cargo and freight app of dfts from judgt of the President May 20 (without assessors)  
The Bd of Works for Wandsworth District v The United Telephone Co lmd app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial in Middlesex May 21  
Dressler v A Zappert (late trading as A Zappert & Co) app of dfts from order of Mr Justice Grove and Baron Huddleston May 22  
Shaw v The Port Philip and Colonial Gold Mining Co, lmd app of dfts from order of Justices Stephen and Mathew giving judgt for the plaintiff, with costs May 27  
Hall Bros and anr v Chadwick and anr app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Cave at trial at Liverpool May 31



*Norris v Walden* app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial in Middlesex June 4  
*The Queen on the Prosecution of John Abbott v Commissioners of Sewers for London* within the Parish of Fobbing and other places (Q B Crown Side) app of debt from judgt of Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Cave on special case June 4

## FROM PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION.

(Admiralty).  
For Hearing.With Nautical Assessors.  
1883.

*Ship Egyptian Monarch* (damage) Owners of *Frances v Owners of Egyptian Monarch* and freight app of pils from judgt of Sir James Hannan Sept 20  
*Ship Glenogle* (damage) Owners of the *Achille* & ors v Owners of the *Glenogle* app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Butt Nov 27  
*Ship Beryl* (damage) Owner, Master and Crew of the *Abeona* v Owners of the *Beryl* and freight app of pils from judgt of Mr Justice Butt Dec 6  
*Ship Beta* & *Peter Graham* (damage) (consolidated actions) Owners of the *Peter Graham* and ors v Owners of the *Beta*, her cargo and freight app of Owners of the *Beta* from judgt of Mr Justice Butt Dec 17  
*Ship St. Leonards* (damage) The General Steam Navigation Co v Shaw, Saville & Co, Owners of *St Leonards* app of pils from judgt of Mr Justice Butt Dec 19

1884.

*Ship John McIntyre & Monica* (damage) (consolidated actions) Owners of the *Monica* and cargo v Owners of the *John McIntyre* and freight app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Butt Jan 14  
*Ship India* (damage) Owners of the *Amity* and ors v Owners of the *India* app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Butt Jan 17  
*Ship Iris* (damage) Owners of the *Heimdal* v Owners of the *Iris* and freight app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Butt Jan 21  
*Ship Glenagarry* (salvage) Owners of the *Gt Western* and ors v Owners of the *Glenagarry*, her cargo and freight app of pils from judgt of the President Feb 25  
*Ship Dordogne* (damage) The *Edith Steamship Co* and ors v Owners of the *Dordogne* app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Butt March 10  
*Ship Emmy Haase* (damage) Barry and ors v Owners of the *Emmy Haase* app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Butt April 8  
*Ship Ralsby* (salvage) Owners of the *Gironde* and ors v Owners of the *Ralsby* and freight app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Butt April 9  
*Ship Visika* (damage) Owners of the *Lady Mulgrave* v Owners of the *Mulgrave* app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Butt April 10  
*Ship Hollandia* (damage) Tyne Steam Shipping Co v General Steam Navigation Co app of debt from judgt of the President June 3

## From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the Queen's Bench Division.

*Birkett, Sperling & Co v Steel, Young & Co* app of pils from Justices Denman, Manisty & Watkin Williams setting aside verdict and judgt and directing new trial—action tried by Baron Pollock in London March 17  
*Jacques v Harrison* app of Official Liquidator of North London Freehold Land, & Co from Justices Denman & Manisty refusing review of tax March 18  
*Musau v Hunting* app of pils from Justices Day and A L Smith setting aside verdict and judgt and directing new trial—action tried at Liverpool by J R L Justice Baggallay Mar 20  
*The Queen v Edwards* and ors, Justices of Norfolk and Eastern and Midlands Railway Co (Q B Crown Side) app of George Henry Morse from order of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Cave for certiorari to quash order of Justices March 24  
*Guy v Leaman* app of debt from Justices Denman and Manisty refusing new trial—action tried by Lord Justice Fry at Cardiff March 26  
*Plumstead District Board of Works v A J Spackman* (Q B Crown Side) app of A J Spackman from the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Stephen and Mathew setting aside refusal of Magistrate and giving liberty to pull down houses over line of deviation March 31  
*In re judgt of Mayor's Court removed to High Court Hanson v Heale* app of debt from Justices Stephen and Day refusing to set aside removal of judgt and appointment of receiver April 1  
*Taylor v Cave* app of pils from judgt of Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Watkin Williams affirming refusal of Master and Judge in chambers for affidavit of documents April 2  
*Presser v Mallinson* (Charles North, Claimant) app of claimant from Justices Day and A L Smith reversing order of Mr Justice Field as to interpleader costs April 2  
*Griffiths v London and St Katharine Dock Co* app of pils from judgt of Justices Day and A L Smith on point of law raised by defence April 2 (transferred to Interlocutory List by order)  
*Stewart v Broderick, Vaughan, & Co* app of pils from order of Justices Day and A L Smith granting new trial action tried by Baron Huddleston in Middlesex April 3  
*Bowby and ors, infants by next friend, v Carter & ors* app of debt Carter from Justices Day and A L Smith setting aside verdict and judgt and directing new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Hawkins April 3  
*County Court Appeal G Mathews v F Ovey* (Q B Crown Side) argument of rule nisi for new trial granted by Court of Appeal after refusal by Justices Manisty and Watkin Williams April 4  
*Compagnie Financiere et Commerciale du Pacifique v Peruvian Guano Co Ltd* app of debt Co from Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Cave upholding Mr Justice Field's order for Directors and ors to answer interrogatories April 4  
*In re Arbitration between George Powers and Messrs Reid and Glasgow* app of George Powers from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Cave refusing to set aside arbitrator's award April 5  
*Henry R. Sed Barril Engineering and Small Arms Co Ltd v Employers' Liability Assoc Corp Ltd* app of debt from Justices Day and A L Smith refusing new trial—action tried by Baron Huddleston in Middlesex April 5  
*Bristol v Gt Eastern Ry Co* app of debt from Justices Watkin Williams and A L Smith refusing new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Hawkins in Middlesex with special jury April 7  
*Presser & Co v Ehrenperger & ors* app of debt from judgt of Justices Day and A L Smith on points of law April 8  
*Dwelling v Torkington & ors* app of pils from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Watkin Williams directing new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Grove;

*In Middlesex Dwelling v Torkington* and ors app of pils from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Watkin Williams dismissing motion for judgt after trial under ord 40, r 2 April 9  
*Walker & ors v Midland Ry Co* app of pils from Justices Manisty and Watkin Williams setting aside verdict and judgt for pils—action tried by Mr Justice Grove in Middlesex with special jury April 10  
*Smithers v Barclay, Hill & Co* app of debt from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Cave directing costs to abide result of reference April 10—not before June 18  
*Compagnie Financiere et Commerciale du Pacifique v The Peruvian Guano Co Ltd* app of pils from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Cave discharging Mr Justice Field's order directing Chairman of Co to answer interrogatories April 10  
*Rudd v Cairns* app of pils from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Cave directing new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Day at York April 10  
*Harker v Abraham* app of pils from Justices Manisty and Watkin Williams refusing new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Hawkins in Middlesex April 17  
*Bryson v Russell* app of debt from Justices Day and A L Smith striking out 4 h par of defence raising points of law April 18  
*Mix & Lindsay v Rust* (Q B Crown Side) app of defendant from Justices Day and A L Smith refusing new trial and affirming judgment for pils—tried at Gloucester County Court April 18  
*Smith v Murphy* app of plaintiff from Justices Manisty and Watkin Williams refusing to set aside verdict and grant new trial—action tried by Baron Pollock April 16  
*King v Oliver & Co Ltd* app of debt from Justices Manisty and Watkin Williams refusing to set aside verdict and grant new trial April 19  
*The North Brierley District Local Board, County of York v Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry Co* (Q B Crown Side) app of the Ry Co from the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Watkin Williams and Cave affirming order of Justices April 21  
*Bellairs v Tucker & ors* app of pils from Justices Denman and Manisty setting aside verdict and judgment and giving judgment for debt—action tried by Mr Justice Lopes with special jury April 21  
*Taylor v Cave* app of pils from Justices Day and A L Smith directing production of ledger account book for inspection of certain entries April 23  
*Weldon v Winslow* app of debt from Justices Denman and Manisty setting aside nonsuit and granting new trial—action tried by Baron Huddleston in Middlesex April 25  
*The Queen v The Judge of the County Court of Surrey, holden at Southwark, and ors* (Q B Crown Side) app of Julia Driscoll (defendant) from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Stephen refusing rule absolute to compel trial of action May 1  
*Hartas v Williamson* app of pils from Mr Justice Grove and Baron Huddleston setting aside orders of master and judge in chambers given leave to defend on payment into court May 1  
*Ship Pontica Comploir d'E-compte de Paris v Owners of Pontica her cargo and freight* app of pils from order of Mr Justice Butt on objection to registrar's report May 8  
*Caw the younger v Whitaker* app of debt from Mr Justice Grove and Baron Huddleston confirming order for trial by official referee May 17  
*Blaiberg v Abraham & Co* app of debt Israel Abrahams from Mr Justice Grove and Baron Huddleston refusing unconditional leave to defend May 19  
*Nickels v Anglo-Indian and Colonial Industrial and Commercial Institution, Ltd* app of debt from Mr Justice Grove and Baron Huddleston refusing unconditional leave to defend May 24  
*Gibson and Co v Sykes* app of debt from Mr Justice Groves and Baron Huddleston setting aside signed judgt on payment into court or security given May 28  
*Thornburn v Crawford* app of pils from Mr Justice Grove and Baron Huddleston affirming order setting aside interrogatories May 31  
*Dunham v Dicketts* app of debt against two orders of Mr Justice Grove and Baron Huddleston dismissing motions in absence of Applicant's Counsel May 31

## Appeals from the Queen's Bench Division.

(Standing over.)

*Hewes v Prudential Assurance Co, Ltd, and Hewes* app of debt Hewes from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes after trial in Middlesex July 13 (S O for security for costs)  
*Leonard v Gilmour* app of debt from judgt of Lord Justice Lindley at trial at Swansea Aug 21 (S O for security for costs)  
*Bethington v Groomer* app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Hawkins at trial in Middlesex Feb 8 (S O for security for costs)  
*Harding & ors v Fowler & ors* app of debt the York & Btg Co from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial Feb 15—S O generally for compromise  
*Ross v Delacere's Extract of Beef Co and ors* app of pils from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in Middlesex Mar 20 (S O for security for costs)  
*Sun Permanent Benefit Building Society v Kent* app of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Cave at trial in Middlesex Mar 20 (S O for security for costs)  
*Combe and Co v Brown and ors* app of debt Margaret Brown and her Sols from order of the Lord Chief Justice & Justices Williams & Cave, dated 12th March and from order of Justices Day & A L Smith, dated 28th March April 4, 1884 (security for £10 ordered April 23)

## FROM THE LONDON BANKRUPTCY COURT.

1884.

In re	Experts	Appeal from
Phillips	Bath	The Chief Judge
Tullemaoche	Revell & ors	Mr Registrar Pepps
Whitelow	Palmer	Mr Registrar Pepps
Kent	G Kent	Mr Registrar Haskitt
Milner	Tolma	Mr Registrar Haskitt
Tullemaoche	Revell & ors	Mr Registrar Pepps
Siskeld	Good	Mr Registrar Pepps
Ben'oit	Dar	Mr Justice Cave
Cutler	Cutler	Mr Justice Cave
Whitelow	Whitelow	Mr Registrar Pepps
Pake & ors	Harrison	County Court Walsall
Walker & Walker	Gould	County Court King's
Neck	Broad	Mr Registrar Haskitt
Strand	Board of Trade	County Court Canterbury
Carter, Fiddes & Co	Taylor	Mr Registrar Pepps
Tullemaoche	Chandler	Mr Registrar Pepps

Mitchell  
Clark & son  
Tollemache

Cunningham  
Clark & son  
Bisset

Mr. Registrar Hazlitt  
Mr. Registrar Murray  
Mr. Registrar Peppas

## SUMMARY OF APPEAL LIST.

	Final	Interlocutory	Total
From the Chancery Division .. ..	162	25	187
From County Palatine Court .. ..	11	—	11
From the Queen's Bench Division ..	92	41	133
From the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, Admiralty with Assessors	14	—	14
From the London Bankruptcy Court ..	19	—	19
Totals ..	298	66	364

## COMPANIES.

## WINDING-UP NOTICES.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.  
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**ALBISIMA PAINT COMPANY, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Chitty, J., dated June 5, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the company be continued. Abrahams and Co. Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioners.

**ANGLO-AFRICAN STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Kay, J., dated May 23, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Crick, Billiter st, and Deacon and Co, Bush lane, Cannon st, solicitors for the petitioners.

**ANGLO-AFRICAN STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Kay, J., has fixed Tuesday, June 24, at 1, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

**ANGLO-AFRICAN STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Kay, J., has, by order dated May 23, appointed John Young, 41, Coleman st, provisional official liquidator.

**COMPOSITE ORE COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Bacon, V.C., has fixed Monday, June 23, at 12, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

**GLOBE STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented June 10, directed to be heard before Chitty, J., on June 21. Rogers and Chave, 6t Winchester st bldgs, solicitors for the petitioner.

**MIRROR LAUNDRY COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Kay, J., has fixed June 24, at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

**SAMUEL BRADBURY AND COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Creditors are required, on or before July 5, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims to Arthur William Blunt, 14, Queen Victoria st. Wednesday, July 16, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims. [Gazette, June 13.]

**BLAENCAELAN UNITED LEAD MINES COMPANY, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Bacon, V.C., dated May 23, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the mines be continued. Hughes, Bedford row, agent for Hughes and Sons, Aberystwyth, solicitors for the petitioners.

**BORAX COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Pearson, J., has, by an order dated May 31, appointed Henry John Leslie, 4 Coleman st, to be the official liquidator.

**CIVIL SERVICE AND GENERAL STORE, LIMITED.**—Chitty, J., has, by an order dated May 18, appointed Joseph John Saffery, 14, Old Jewry chbrs, to be official liquidator.

**CHATTERLEY IRON COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Chitty, J., has fixed June 27, at 11, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

**CHESHIRE BANKING COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented June 12, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on June 27. Henry, Furnival's inn, Holborn, solicitor for the petitioner.

**LEICESTER CLUB AND COUNTY RACE COURSE COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Pearson, J., has, by an order dated May 29, appointed Edwin Playter Speeds, Friar lane, Leicester, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before July 12, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims to the above. Wednesday, July 16, at 1, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

**LICENSED VICTUALLERS' GUARDIAN NEWSPAPER COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Creditors are required, on or before July 12, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims to William Brock Keen, 18, King st, Cheap-side. Tuesday, July 29, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims. [Gazette, June 17.]

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.  
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**SYKE MILL COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Bristowe, V.C., has fixed Tuesday, June 24, at 11.30, at 2, Clarence st, Manchester, for the appointment of an official liquidator. [Gazette, June 13.]

## FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

**HAVELOCK TEMPERANCE FRIENDLY SOCIETY, 65, Chalton st, St Pancras.** June 10

**MOUNTAIN ASH FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Navigation Hotel, Mountain Ash, Glamorgan.** June 10

**LUDLOW PHILANTHROPIC FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Elephant and Castle Inn, Ludlow.** June 10

**PAUL PROVIDENT SOCIETY, National School, Church Town, St Paul, nr Penzance, Cornwall.** June 10

[Gazette, June 13.]

The directors of the Hull, Barnsley, and West Riding Junction Railway and Dock Company invite subscriptions for an issue of £1,800,000 Five per Cent. Perpetual Preference Stock at the price of £85. The present issue is required for the purpose of completing such of the works as are absolutely necessary to enable the main line between Cudworth and Hull, together with the Alexandra Dock, to be opened for traffic, and become a revenue-earning property. The prospectus states that the contractors have undertaken to complete the works by January 1, 1885, for a sum not exceeding the engineer's estimates, and that £4,000,000 has already been expended on the undertaking, of which £3,000,000 is ordinary share capital, over which the present issue ranks as a preference stock. The lists close on the 26th inst.

## CREDITORS' CLAIMS.

CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.  
LAST DAY OF PROOF.

**CHEESE, Rev JOHN EDMUND, Ledbury, Hereford, Clerk in Holy Orders.** June 27. Knight Eaton v Cheese, Chitty, J. Mills, New sq, Lincoln's inn

**CONSTABLE, MAURICE, Wix, Essex.** June 30. Stocken v Constable, Pearson, J. Cummins, Devonshire chbrs, Bishopsgate st Without

**FENTON, HENRY, Wick rd, South Hackney, Greengrocer.** June 23. Fenton v Fenton, Pearson, J. Harper, Wood lane

**THOMAS, JOHN, New Tredegar, Monmouth, Builder.** June 18. Thomas v Thomas, Bacon, V.C. Morgau, Cardiff [Gazette, May 30.]

**EDGE, ELLEN ESTHER, Englefield rd, Canonbury.** June 23. Edge v Edge, Bacon, V.C. Wynne, Chancery lane [Gazette, June 3.]

**HAYWARD, WILLIAM, Pen Bryn, Carnarvon, Gent.** July 3. Williams and Co v Hayward, Chitty, J. Roberts

**JAMES, WALTER, Ryton, Durham, Lead Manufacturer.** July 3. James v James, Chitty, J. Joel, Newcastle on Tyne [Gazette, June 10.]

**WATSON, HENRY, Lingerwood, Edinburgh, Farmer.** July 16. Caulton v Caulton, Pearson, J. Steele, Sherborne lane [Gazette, June 13.]

CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.  
LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

**BARTLETT, JAMES, Lancaster rd, East Barnet, Hertford, Retired Horse Slaughtering.** June 24. Montagu and Co, Gray's inn sq

**BEADLE, FRANCIS JOHN, Confectioner, Lunatic Asylum at Banstead, Surrey.** June 30. Mead and Sons, Arundell st, Coventry st

**BIRKESHAU, MARGARET JANE ISABELLA, Newcastle upon Tyne.** July 1. Bolton and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

**BROCKWAY, JOHN, Hordle, nr Lymington, Southampton, Stonemason.** Aug 30. Basset and Co, Southampton

**BURT, MARTHA, Jermyn st, St James's, Lodging house Keeper.** July 1. Cutler and Co, King st, St James's

**CARR, MARY JANE, Josephine avenue, Brixton.** July 15. Carr and Son, Road lane

**CHEESMAN, SARAH COOMBS, Folkestone.** July 16. Mowll and Mowll, Dover

**EDWARDS, EDWARD, Portland place North, Lower Clapton, Hackney.** July 10. Cheston and Sons, Great Winchester st

**ELLIOTT, JOHN SHERMAN, Maida Vale, Paddington, Esq.** July 31. Darvill and Co, New Windsor, Berks

**FARROW, CHARLES, Marlborough Hill, St John's Wood.** Aug 1. Champion and Co, Ironmonger lane

**FLETCHER, SAMUEL, Manchester, Pawnbroker.** Aug 30. Whitaker, Duchy o Lancaster Office

**GLADSTONE, CHARLOTTE LOUISE ALEXANDRA, Brighton.** July 15. Tatham and Pyrl, Fredericks place, Old Jewry

**HAINSWORTH, TIMOTHY, Bradford, Boot Maker.** July 1. Hutchinson and Son, Bradford

**HARTLEY, MARIA, Croxland Moor, nr Huddersfield.** June 28. Laycock and Co, Huddersfield

**HAWKINS, WILLIAM LUDLOW, Cirencester, Gloucester, Grocer.** July 12. Mullings and Co, Cirencester

**HAYWARD, MARIANNE, Colchester.** July 14. Turner and Co, Colchester

**HELYAR, JOHN WEILMAN, Belgrave rd, Retired Colonel.** July 15. Findgate and Findgate, Craven st, Strand

**HOWELL, SARAH, Sandbach, Chester.** June 21. Stringer, Sandbach, Cheshire

**KEPPEL, Hon and Rev EDWARD SOUTHWELL, Quidenham, Norfolk, Clerk in Holy Orders.** July 3. Clowes, Attleborough

**LANDALE, GEORGE OATES, Kingston upon Hull, Fruit Merchant.** July 1. Woodhouse, Hull

**LOVELAND, MARY ANNE FRANCES, Bramerton st, Chelsea.** July 15. Mead and MILDWAY, KITTY ANNE ST JOHN, Beryl, nr Wells, Somerset. July 18. Jennings, Great Winchester st

**MOON, MARIA, Bedford.** July 15. Tebbis, Bedford

**RODERICK, ELIZABETH, Rossal School, nr Fleetwood, Lancaster.** June 30. Forrest, Birkenhead

**SPARROW, Rev MONTAGU PENNINGTON FLORENTINO ROMULUS, Vicar of Temple Grafton, Warwick.** July 5. Platt, Robert st, Adelphi

**WALLACE, JOHN WILLIAM, Beech st, Barbican, Linen Draper.** June 21. Lovell and Co, Gray's inn sq [Gazette, June 3.]

**BARTON, THOMAS, Castle Bromwich, Warwick, Farmer.** July 4. Smith and Co, Birmingham

**BEADLE, FRANCIS JOHN, Norland ter, Notting Hill, Confectioner.** June 30. Mead and Sons, Arundell st, Coventry st

**BLYTH, Rev CHARLES DETHICK, Sutton Rectory, Bedford, Clerk in Holy Orders.** July 6. Hooper and Co, Biggleswade, Beds

**CAMPBELL, THOMAS, Haverfordwest, Draper.** July 9. Price, Haverfordwest

**CAVELL, GEORGE HENRY, John st, Adelphi, Esq.** July 10. Cavell, Waterloo place, Pall Mall

**CLOSE, MARK CURRIE, Orsett ter, Hyde park, Esq.** July 17. Hanbury and Co, New Broad st

**DYNE, FRANCIS GEORGE BRADLEY, Chapel st, Belgrave sq, Esq.** July 10. Cavell, Waterloo pl

**FINCH, MARY, Send, Surrey.** July 7. Davie, New inn, Strand

**FOX, STEPHEN SMALLPEECE, Orpington, Kent, Gent.** July 21. Aldridge, Montague pl, Russell sq

**FURBER, CHARLES JAMES, Hanger, Ealing, Esq.** Aug 1. Burne and Rooke, Bath

**HOWIS, EMMA FRISBY, Tulse hill, Surrey.** July 12. Few and Co, Surrey st, Strand

**LAMBERT, THOMAS, Barrow in Furness, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler.** Aug 1. Jackson, Barrow in Furness

**LATHAM, CHRISTINA, Torquay.** Oct 1. Hooper and Wollen, Torquay

**LITTLE, DINAH LOVEDAY, Croydon.** June 30. Rowland, Croydon

**LONGCROFT, THOMAS CHAUFURD, St James's sq, Major-General.** July 12. Free-trading Co, Brighton

**MAKINSON, RICHARD, Aspall, nr Wigan, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler.** July 12. Barlow, Wigan

**NORTON, WILLIAM, Reigate.** July 15. Smith and Wilmer, Lincoln's inn

**ONSLOW, Rev MIDDLETON, East Peckham Vicarage, Kent.** June 24. Tanner, Dorset

**PICK, JAMES, Plymouth, Wine Merchant.** Aug 1. Whiteford and Bennett, Plymouth

**RATHMAY, CHRISTIAN, Salmon's lane, Limehouse, Baker.** July 18. Goldberg and Langdon, West st, Finsbury sq

**REES, ELIZA, Hatcham, Surrey.** July 31. Croese and Sons, Lancaster place, Strand

ROBINSON, Kitching, Rhodes, GEORGE, SOLOMON, FRANK, 28, Soho sq, TAYLOR, CHAS, and Co, Q THOMAS, JO, Camborne WADE, THOMAS, Coggeshall, WILLEY, TH, Harrop, St

BATES, ROBERT, Francis and BENHAM, A, Bouvierie, BROADWAY, T, READSHAW, WOODS, W, BROOKS, W, SHELL, C, CASTER, W, CHADWICK, CALLIS, BLA, CHATTERLEY, Tyler, Lin CLARK, JAMES, CORNFORTH, English, S, DEMPSTER, A, Liverpool DITCHER, ROBERT, EDGE, JAMES, EYRE, ROBERT, July 1. F HATHFIELD, HATFORTH, and Tilly, HOLDORN, R, Woburn, J, JACKSON, J, LEYD, R, Queen Vic, McCORMACK, & Cheap, MOORE, Rev MORRISON, Salisbury NASE, RICH, PENNY, Rev, July 8. N PERKINS, J, PONSFORD, pl, Holbo ROBERTS, E, ROBINSON, inn, SLADE, WIT, SLATH, JO, SUTHER, SA, SWEEPS, SE, Liverpool TAYLOR, LE, borough, TILLY, JAM, Falmouth WEST, ALIC, WESTON, CH, WHITTING, Chancery WILLIAMS, WINSOR AN

BARKER, E, BATTLE, SO, CARROLL, I, ROGERS, F, CARE-ELLI, and HARV COOKSON, E, spur st, ELLIOTT, H, EDGE, JAM, FARANTS, De Zoete, GOULD, GE, Ratcliff, I, HARTLEY, E, HODGKIN, Co, New IRKSON, CH, JACKSON, V, LEWIS, ER, MARSHALL, MURLEY, F, St. Hills ORSBORN, ampton SMITH, GE, LOUI SMITHSON, den, Ches SUINO, LUT, TALBOTT, T, I. Bartr TRIMPEST, VADGHAN, WILKINSON, Bank che

BILLINGS, lane, Que BLAKE, SU, borough



ROBINSON, WILLIAM, Lockton, nr Scarborough, Farmer. July 1. Watts and Kitching, Scarborough  
RHODES, GEORGE, Leeds, Yeoman. Aug 5. Bromet and Co, Leeds  
SCHIA, FRANCESCO, Welbeck st, Cavendish sq. July 8. Allen and Son, Carlisle st, Soho sq  
TAYLOR, CHARLES, Mount Ephraim rd, Streatham hill, Esq. Aug 1. Pattison and Co, Queen Victoria st  
THOMAS, JOHN, Phillack, Cornwall, Yeoman. June 30. Daniell and Thomas, Camborne  
WADE, THOMAS ORPEN, Witham, Essex, Gent. Aug 12. Beaumont and Son, Coggeshall, Essex  
WILLEY, THOMAS, Swinton Bridge, York, Boat Owner. July 21. Harrop and Harrop, Swinton

[Gazette, June 6.]

DAVIS, ROBERT, Chesham, Buckingham, Wooden Ware Manufacturer. Aug 9. Francis and How, Chesham  
REHAM, AUGUSTUS, Bromley, Kent, Coppermith. July 20. Watson and Co, Bouverie st, Fleet st  
RICHARD, WILLIAM, Bath, Retired Grocer. Aug 30. Simmons and Co, Bath  
RICHARD, THOMAS, Roby, Lancaster, Gent. July 15. Swift, Liverpool  
RICHARD, THOMAS, Bristol, Asphalt Contractor. July 5. Buckland, Bristol  
RICHARDSON, MARY STAPLETON, Rainhill, Lancaster. Sept 29. Ashton and Woods, Watlington  
ROOKS, WILLIAM, Newark upon Trent, Foreman Maltster. July 16. Ibbotson, Sheffield  
RULOCK, CAROLINE, Ayleham, Norfolk. Aug 31. Sinnock, Hailsham, Sussex  
CARTER, WILLIAM, Bromley, Kent. July 5. Horsley, Bull and Mouth st  
CHADWICK, THOMAS, Blackburn, Lancaster, Innkeeper. July 18. Holland and Calla, Blackburn  
CHATTERLEY, WILLIAM WILSON, Clapham rd, Professor of Dancing. July 25. Tyler, Lincoln's inn fields  
CLARK, JANE, Scarborough. July 18. Watts and Kitching, Scarborough  
CORNFORTH, WILLIAM, Edgbaston, Warwick, Wire Manufacturer. Aug 20. English, Stamford  
DEMPSTER, ALEXANDER, Aigburth, nr Liverpool, Gent. Aug 1. Martin and Co, Liverpool

DYCE, ROBERT, Derby, Gent. July 31. Robotham and Attwood, Derby  
EDGE, JAMES, Chester, st, Portland pl. July 10. Lekiche and Son, Rood lane  
EYRE, ROBERT HENRY, Eyre, Eling, Southampton, Retired Commander R.N. July 1. Footner and Son, Romsey  
HATHERLY, EDWARD JOHN, Bristol, Builder. July 1. Pearson, Bristol  
HATHORNTWATTE, THOMAS, Lancaster, Clerk in Holy Orders. Aug 1. Johnson and Tilly, Lancaster  
HOLDEN, ROBERT, Fenny Stratford, Bucks, Yeoman. July 10. Tanqueray, Woburn, Beds

JACKSON, JAMES, South Shields, Boat Builder. June 30. Osborne, South Shields  
LYOT, RICHARD MIDDLETON, Wrexham, Denbigh, Esq. July 21. Stevens, Queen Victoria st  
MCGRACKEN, MARY ANN, Dacre Park, Blackheath. Aug 1. Potter and Co, King st, Chapside  
MOORE, Rev. BERNARD, Crook, Westmorland, Clerk. July 19. Bolton, Kendal  
MORRISON, GEORGE, Downton, Wilts, Esq. July 19. Whatman and Fulton, Salisbury

NASE, RICHARD, Martly, Worcester, Esq. Aug 1. Hyde, Worcester  
PENNY, Rev CHARLES, St Mary's Wyke Regis, Dorset, Clerk in Holy Orders. July 8. Newman and Co, Yeovil  
PERKINS, JANE HORNBY, Torquay. Aug 1. Hooper and Wollen, Torquay  
PONSFORD, JAMES FREDERICK, Porchester ter, Bayswater. July 26. Heron, Ely pl, Holborn

ROBERTS, EDWARD WILLIAM, Oswestry, Salop, Farmer. July 2. Donne, Oswestry  
ROBINSON, SUSAN, Leamington, Warwick. Aug 1. Symes and Sons, Furnival inn  
SLADE, WILLIAM, Dorchester, Gent. July 10. Symonds and Son, Dorchester  
SLATER, JOSEPH, Derby, Gent. July 31. Robotham and Attwood, Derby  
SQUIRE, SAMUEL, Sheffield, Lime Merchant. July 16. Ibbotson, Sheffield  
STEELE, SPENCER JAMES, Halewood, Lancaster, Esq. July 29. Miller and Co, Liverpool

TAYLOR, WILLIAM, Scarborough, Esq. July 18. Watts and Kitching, Scarborough  
TILLY, JAMES, Budock, Cornwall, Retired Master Mariner. July 7. Jenkins, Falmouth  
WEST, ALICIA AMY, Tonbridge, Kent. July 5. Stenning, Tonbridge  
WESTON, CHARLES, Birmingham, Gent. July 2. Gem and Co, Birmingham  
WHITTINGHAM, ANTHONY, Bolsover st, Portland pl, Esq. July 5. Poole and Co, Chancery lane

WILLIAMS, MARTHA LLOYD, Chester. July 5. Bowlings and Co, Essex st, Strand  
WINSOR ANN, Paignton, Devon. June 13. Eastley and Jarman, Paignton

[Gazette, June 10.]

BARBER, EDWARD, Leeds, Gent. Aug 1. Craven, Leeds  
BATTLE, SOPHIA, Doncaster, York. July 19. Palmer, Doncaster  
CABILL, DAVID, Mirzapur, British India, Superintendent of Police. July 25. Rogers, Parliament st, Westminster  
CAR-ELLISON, RALPH, Hedgley, Northumberland, Esq. July 14. Leadbitter and Harvey, Newcastle upon Tyne  
COOPER, HENRY, Leeds, Commercial Clerk. July 10. Pearce and Sons, Giltspur st

ELLIOTT, HARRIET, Maids Vale. Aug 30. Darvall and Co, New Windsor  
EDGE, JAMES, Charlotte st, Portland pl. July 10. Le Riche and Son, Rood lane  
FARRANTS, CHARLOTTE, Marquess rd, Canonbury, Islington. July 10. Smith and De Zoete, Finsbury circus  
GOULD, GEORGE HANDY, Woodford Bridge, Essex, Licensed Victualler. July 10. Batcliff, Bishopsgate st Within

HARTLEY, JANE, Nottingham, Kent. July 19. Clarke and Co, Gresham House  
HODGKIN, JULIA ELIZABETH, Stockwell Park rd, Brixton. July 13. Hughes and Co, New Broad st  
IMSON, CHRISTINA, Thornhill rd, Barnsbury. July 11. Kite, Queen Victoria st  
JACKSON, WILLIAM, Richmond, Gent. July 10. Jackson, Doncaster  
LEWIS, ERNEST, Hastings, Gent. July 24. Freeman and Co, Brighton  
MARSHALL, DAVID, Lombard st. Sept 1. Neish and Howell, Watling st  
MURLEY, FRANK, Jardin st, Albany rd, Old Kent rd, Soap Manufacturer. July 8. Hilbery, Billiter st

OSBORN, JOHN, Wokingham, Berks, Esq. July 29. Lomer and Son, Southampton  
SMITH, GEORGE, North Elkington, Lincoln, Farmer. July 1. Sharpley and Sons, Louth  
SMITHSON, HENRY, Chesterfield, Derby, Postmaster. July 1. Gratton and Marsden, Chesterfield  
SUNG, LUTUI, Grove rd, Hounslow, Professor of Music. July 12. Ball, Staines  
TALBOT, THOMAS WATSON, Blomfield rd, Maids Hill, Veterinary Surgeon, July 1. Barfield, Old Jewry

TEMPER, WILLIAM, Otley, York, Butcher. July 12. Siddall, Otley  
VAUGHAN, JOHN, Margate, Gent. July 16. Richards, Warwick st, Regent at  
WILKINSON, JOHN, Redhill, Surrey, Plumber. Aug 1. Hubbard, Joint Stock Bank chambers, West Smithfield

[Gazette, June 13.]

BILLINGS, ANTOINETTE, Werter rd, Putney. July 12. Tippetts and Son, Maiden lane, Queen st  
BLAKE, SUSANNA, Bramerton Hall, Norfolk. Aug 1. Percival and Son, Peterborough

BROADBENT, MARY ANN, Esmonde, The Park, Highgate. July 11. Hargrove and Co, Victoria st, Westminster  
BROOKS, MARY ELIZA, Brixton rd. Aug 1. Whites and Co, Budge row, Cannon st  
BROWNLOW, CHARLES, Tonge with Haugh, nr Bolton, Bleacher. July 14. Balshaw, Bolton

BOWTHER, FRANCIS WILLIAM, Fenchurch st, Colonial Broker. July 12. Van Sanden and Co, King st, Cheapside  
BURRELL, EDWARD, Lincoln's inn fields, Solicitor. July 21. King and Mossop, North bldgs, Finsbury circus  
CORAM, ANN, Albert st, Regent's pk. July 21. Munton and Morris, Queen Victoria st  
DAVIS, CHARLES CHAPPEL, Bath, Retired Gas Engineer. July 17. Tittley, Bath  
DYKE, THOMAS, Aberystwith, Monmouth, Saddler. July 21. Browne, Aberystwith

EDWARDS, GEORGE DAVID, Western Counties Hotel, Paddington. July 31. Nutsey, Shrewsbury  
GILL, FRANCIS BUTCHER, Bath, Gent. Aug 1. Watson and Co, Nottingham  
GRIFFITH, JOHN, Hawarden, Flint, Gent. Aug 4. Brown and Rogers, Chester  
HADLOW, GEORGE ELSE, Wormshill, Kent, Blacksmith. June 30. Beale and Co, Maidstone  
HOPPER, JOHN, Hackness, York, Farmer. July 25. Watts and Kitching, Scarborough

HORLOCK, MARY ANN Dacre BROOKE, Winton, nr Ringwood, Hants. July 12. Welch and Son, Wells, Somerset  
HUFFELL, MARY, Kepler rd, Bedford rd, Clapham. Aug 1. Child, William st, Albert Gate  
LEECH, WILLIAM, Settle, York. July 31. Hartley, Settle  
LEWIS, THOMAS COURTNEY, Sandown, Isle of Wight, Gent. July 5. Lewis, Adelaide pl, London Bridge

LODGE, THOMAS, Millfield villa, Highgate rise, Gent. July 12. Booth, Gray's inn sq  
MILLS, SARAH, Millbrook, Cornwall. July 12. Snell and Holman, Plymouth  
OLIVER, FRANCES, Tachbrook, Warwick. July 15. Wright and Hassall, Leamington  
PORRITT, SAMUEL, Bamford, nr Rochdale, Lancaster, Wooden Manufacturer. Aug 14. Hinde and Co, Manchester  
SCOTT, EBERNEZER SAMUEL, Shrewsbury, Bachelor of Medicine. July 31. Nutsey, Shrewsbury

STRACHAN, THOMAS, Derby, Builder. July 30. Leech and Co, Derby  
THOMPSON, MATTHEW, Blackburn, Lancaster, Clogger. Aug 16. Cooper, Blackburn  
VICKERY, ALFRED, Bath, Lodging House Keeper. July 17. Tittley, Bath  
WILSON, GEORGE, Kingston upon Hull, Gent, Chief Engineer. Aug 11. Martinson, Hull

[Gazette, June 17.]

## SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

June 23.—Messrs. BLAKE, HADDOCK, & CARPENTER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties and Building Land (see advertisement, June 14, p. 14).

June 23.—Messrs. RICHARDS & AYRES, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Properties (see advertisements, June 14, p. 11).

June 24.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold, Leasehold, and Copyhold Estates (see advertisements, June 14, pp. 3, 4).

June 24.—Messrs. VENTON, BULL, & COOPER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Property (see advertisement, May 24, p. 2).

June 25.—Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Rent Charges (see advertisement, June 14, p. 13).

June 26.—Messrs. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & Co., at the Mart, Freehold and Manorial Estate (see advertisement, May 24, p. 3).

June 26.—Mr. JOHN LEE, at the Mart, at 1 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 636).

June 26.—Mr. B. A. REEVES, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, June 14, p. 14).

## BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

### BIRTHS.

ANDERSON-MORSEHEAD.—June 13, at 4, Alexander-street, Bayswater, W., the wife of John Yonge Anderson-Morsehead, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, of a son.

FIELD.—May 2, at Sydney, N. S. Wales, the wife of Edward Percy Field, barrister-at-law, of a son.

KNIGHT.—June 16, at Ridgewood, Sylvan-road, Upper Norwood, the wife of W. Frederick Knight, solicitor, of a daughter.

MACMEIKAN.—June 12, at 45, Leamington-road, Bayswater, the wife of John A. Macmeikan, barrister-at-law, of a son.

SMITH.—June 16, at Mount Pleasant, Glazebrook, the wife of Wyndham Smith, of Manchester, solicitor, of a daughter.

WHINNEY.—June 14, at 22, St. Edmund's-terrace, N.W., the wife of Frederick Whinney, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

### MARRIAGE.

CLARKSON—BAIRSTOW.—June 11, at Sutton-in-Craven, James Nicholson Clarkson, solicitor, Kelsghly, to Emily, daughter of the late Matthew Bairstow, of Springfield, Crosshills, Yorkshire.

### DEATHS.

MARRIOTT.—June 4, at Zanzibar, G. R. Laxon Marriott, B.A., LL.B., Cambridge, barrister-at-law, aged 50 years.

THOMPSON.—June 8, at Lucerne, Switzerland, George Thompson, barrister-at-law, aged 74 years.

WATTS.—June 16, at Edgchaston, Birmingham, Robert J. Watts, solicitor and coroner of Dudley, aged 55 years.

## LONDON GAZETTES.

### Bankrupts.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, June 13, 1884.

Maitland, George Gamie, Pall Mall, Gent. June 11.

## THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.

FRIDAY, June 18, 1884.

## RECEIVING ORDERS.

Coldwell, James, New Mill, nr Huddersfield, Woollen Cloth Manufacturer. Huddersfield. Pet June 11. Ord June 11. Exam June 23.  
 Coxon, John Bailey, White House, Washington, Grease Manufacturer. Sunderland. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam June 19 at 2.30.  
 Farrell, Joseph George, Liverpool, Horse Dealer. Liverpool. Pet May 23. Ord June 9. Exam June 19 at 11.  
 Fenwick, Thomas, Swansea, Steamship Broker. Swansea. Pet May 28. Ord June 9. Exam July 17.  
 Garth, Joshua, Leeds, Innkeeper. Leeds. Pet June 11. Ord June 11. Exam June 25 at 2.  
 Gibson, George, Denmark hill, Surrey, Fishmonger. High Court. Pet May 23. Ord June 10. Exam July 18 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Goose, William, Frampton, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Boston. Pet June 9. Ord June 10. Exam June 24.  
 Hartley, Japheth, and James Mitchell, Morley, Yorkshire, Woollen Manufacturers. Leeds. Pet May 30. Ord June 10. Exam June 25 at 2.  
 Hedgecland, William Martin, Wrotham rd, Camden Town, Organ Builder. High Court. Pet June 11. Ord June 11. Exam July 18 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Hooper, Thomas, Gloucester, Commission Agent. Gloucester. Pet June 7. Ord June 9. Exam July 15.  
 Hume, James Robert, Sunderland, Licensed Victualler. Sunderland. Pet June 10. Ord June 10. Exam June 19 at 2.30.  
 Julian, Thomas Ennor, and Henry Julian, Marshall st, St George's rd, Southwark, Builders. High Court. Pet May 29. Ord June 9. Exam July 18 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 McQuilton, William, Bristol, Grocer. Bristol. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam July 11.  
 Osborne, Henry John, Nottingham, Builder. Nottingham. Pet June 10. Ord June 10. Exam June 19 at 2.30.  
 Queenan, James, Sunderland, Picture Framers. Sunderland. Pet June 10. Ord June 10. Exam June 19 at 2.30.  
 Ramsden, William, Morley, Yorkshire, Cloth Manufacturer. Dewsbury. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam June 24.  
 Symington, Sarah Jane, Consett, Durham, Fruiterer. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam June 19.  
 Tingle, William, Sheffield, Rag Merchant. Sheffield. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam July 9 at 11.30.  
 Wyld, Robert Henry, Leeds, Gas Engineer. Leeds. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam June 25 at 2.

## FIRST MEETINGS.

Bedwell, George, Southend, Boot Maker. June 23 at 3. United Mercantile Agency, 13, Cheapside.  
 Clifford, James Cordwell, Uxbridge rd, Dealer in Fancy Goods. June 20 at 3. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.  
 Coldwell, James, New Mill, nr Huddersfield, Woollen Cloth Manufacturer. June 25 at 4. Official Receiver, New st, Huddersfield.  
 Coxon, John Bailey, Whitehouse, Washington, Grease Maker. June 23 at 12. The Law Society's chbrs, 32, John st, Sunderland.  
 Evans, Morgan, Lismore circus, Haverstock hill, Magazine Proprietor. June 20 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.  
 Garth, Joshua, Leeds, Innkeeper. June 23 at 3. Official Receiver, 22, Park row, Leeds.  
 Goward, Paul, Lime st sq, General Merchant. June 23 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn.  
 Haggood, James, Bristol, Shipowner. June 21 at 12. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Bristol.  
 Hartley, Japheth, and James Mitchell, Morley, Leeds, Woollen Manufacturers. June 29 at 12. Official Receiver, St Andrew's chambers, 22, Park row, Leeds.  
 Higham, Thomas Russell, St Neot, Cornwall, Grocer. June 27 at 10.30. Official Receiver, 18, Frankfort st, Plymouth.  
 Hooper, Thomas, Gloucester, Commission Agent. June 21 at 3. Official Receiver, 84, Barton st, Gloucester.  
 Horton, Ellen, Kate Horton, and Clara Horton, Southsea, Hampshire, Milliners. June 24 at 12. Chamber of Commerce, 145, Cheapside.  
 Lewis, Cornelius Thomas, Wilberforce rd, Finsbury park, Keg Maker. June 23 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.  
 McQuilton, William, Bristol, Grocer. June 21 at 11. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Bristol.  
 Meller, Thomas, Sheffield, Grocer. June 23 at 4. Law Society's Rooms, Bank st, Sheffield.  
 Miller, Henry, Worthing, Retired Clerk in the Custom House. June 20 at 2. Chambers of Commerce, London.  
 Parkin, Thomas, Hereford, Chemist. June 25 at 11. Official Receiver, 2, Offa st, Hereford.  
 Prince, Paul, Croxden, Staffordshire, Farmer. June 20 at 4. Official Receiver, Newcastle under Lyme.  
 Ramsden, William, Morley, Yorkshire, Cloth Manufacturer. June 23 at 2.30. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Batley.  
 Robinson, James, Liverpool, Foreman of Locomotive Department of Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company. June 23 at 2. Official Receiver, Lisbon bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool.  
 Shand, William Francis, Cannon st. June 23 at 3. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Sharman, Joseph Lewis, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer. June 21 at 12. County Court bldgs, Northampton.  
 Smith, Herbert James, Buxton, Norfolk, Butcher. June 21 at 11. Official Receiver, Queen st, Norwich.  
 Symington, Sarah Jane, Consett, Durham, Fruiterer. June 21 at 11. Official Receiver, County chbrs, Westgate rd, Newcastle on Tyne.  
 Thomas, James, Berriew, Montgomeryshire, Lame Merchant. June 23 at 12. Public Rooms, Newtown.  
 Tingle, William, Sheffield, Rag Merchant. June 23 at 2. Official Receiver, Figtree lane, Sheffield.  
 Walmesley, Vivian Oswald, and Ebenezer Lewis, Park st, Islington, Picture Frame Manufacturers. June 26 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Wyld, Robert Henry, Leeds, Gas Engineer. June 23 at 11. Official Receiver, St Andrew's chbrs, 22, Park row, Leeds.

## ADJUDICATIONS.

Abbott, William James, Norwich, Shoe Manufacturer. Norwich. Pet May 27. Ord June 9.  
 Bibby, Thomas, Openshaw, Lancashire, Shop Keeper. Manchester. Pet May 13. Ord June 10.  
 Bones, Richard John, Dover, Trinity Cinque Ports Pilot. Canterbury. Pet May 26. Ord June 7.  
 Butterfield, Charles, Ironmonger lane, Solicitor. High Court. Pet Feb 12. Ord May 27.  
 Chesterton, Sam, and Frederick William Cresswell, Stamford, Lincolnshire, Wine Merchants. Peterborough. Pet May 27. Ord June 10.  
 Collard, Benjamin, Liverpool rd, Islington, Ham Dealer. High Court. Pet Feb 27. Ord June 9.  
 Eccleston, Joseph, Birmingham, Draper. Birmingham. Pet May 26. Ord June 10.  
 Elms, Philip Lester, Middle lane, Crouch End, Lodging House Keeper. High Court. Pet Feb 22. Ord June 9.

Finn, Alfred Harley, St Ann's rd, Stamford hill, Plumber. Edmonton. Pet May 28. Ord June 10.  
 Hedgecland, William Martin, Wrotham rd, Camden Town, Organ Builder. High Court. Pet June 11. Ord June 11.  
 Heselgrave, Charles Conlam, Dorking, Builder. Croydon. Pet May 12. Ord June 9.  
 Hooper, Thomas, Gloucester, Commission Agent. Gloucester. Pet June 7. Ord June 10.  
 Horsfall, Ben, Hepworth, near Huddersfield, Tailor. Huddersfield. Pet May 27. Ord June 10.  
 Jennings, William, and George Henry Jennings, Sutton, Surrey, Builders. Croydon. Pet April 17. Pet June 9.  
 Lyons, Joseph, Camden rd, Camden Town, Jeweller. High Court. Pet April 11. Ord June 10.  
 Machell, Leonard, Fulham rd, Boot Dealer. High Court. Pet May 18. Ord June 10.  
 Parkinson, Foster, Market Weighton, Yorkshire, Corn Dealer. York. Pet May 23. Ord June 9.  
 Pickup, James, and John Henry Pickup, Waterfoot, Lancashire, Drysalter. Oldham. Pet May 30. Ord June 11.  
 Prest, Richard, York, Tailor. York. Pet May 25. Ord June 9.  
 Queenan, James, Sunderland, Picture Framers. Sunderland. Pet June 10. Ord June 11.  
 Ramsden, William, Morley, Yorkshire, Cloth Manufacturer. Dewsbury. Pet June 9. Ord June 10.  
 Smith, Herbert James, Buxton, Norfolk, Butcher. Norwich. Pet May 22. Ord June 11.  
 Tingle, William, Sheffield, Rag Merchant. Sheffield. Pet June 9. Ord June 9.  
 Wilson, Edward, Darlaston, Staffordshire, Draper. Walsall. Pet April 10. Ord June 7.  
 Wilson, John, Gascoyne rd, South Hackney, Shipowner. High Court. Pet Mar 15. Ord June 9.  
 Wyld, Robert Henry, Leeds, Gas Engineer. Leeds. Pet June 9. Ord June 11.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1884.

## RECEIVING ORDERS.

Ackroyd, Joss, Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, Grocer. Northampton. Pet June 14. Ord June 14. Exam July 16.  
 Albland, Charles, Southam, Warwickshire, Boot Maker. Warwick. Pet June 14. Ord June 14. Exam July 15.  
 Bainbridge, John Joseph, Gateshead, Whitesmith. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet June 14. Ord June 14. Exam June 28.  
 Collier, George, Witney, Oxfordshire, Greengrocer. Oxford. Pet June 10. Ord June 10. Exam July 17 at 11.30.  
 Engels, Christian, Union rd, Tufnell Park, Commission Merchant. High Court. Pet June 13. Ord June 13. Exam July 18 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Francis, Evan, Merthyr Tydfil, Labourer. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet June 12. Ord June 13. Exam June 30.  
 Francis, Thomas, Rhonda Valley, Grocer. Pontypridd. Pet June 13. Ord June 13. Exam July 8 at 2.  
 Gibson, Charles Edward Thornton, Cheltenham, Gent. Cheltenham. Pet June 14. Ord June 14. Exam July 4 at 12.  
 Greaves, James, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. Birmingham. Pet June 11. Ord June 12. Exam July 3.  
 Harvey, John, Poole, Boot Manufacturer. Poole. Pet June 13. Ord June 13. Exam June 20.  
 Jones, John Samuel, Merthyr Tydfil, Clothier. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet June 12. Ord June 12. Exam June 30.  
 Layard, Thomas W., Ramsgate, Plasterer. Canterbury. Pet May 30. Ord June 13. Exam June 27.  
 Miles, Thomas, Long Clawson, Leicestershire, Farmer. Nottingham. Pet June 13. Ord June 13. Exam July 15.  
 Perkins, John, Sandwich, Wine Merchant. Canterbury. Pet June 12. Ord June 12. Exam June 27.  
 Stocks, Alfred, Messingham, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Gt Grimsby. Pet May 29. Ord June 13. Exam June 27 at 12 at Townhall, Gt Grimsby.  
 Townsend, Joseph, Liversedge, Yorkshire, Currier. Dewsbury. Pet May 30. Ord June 11. Exam June 24.  
 Waddington, Frederick Eden, and William Eden Waddington, Basinghall st, Umbrella Manufacturers. High Court. Pet May 17. Ord June 13. Exam July 22 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Warrington, James, Fenton, Beerseller. Stoke upon Trent. Pet May 30. Ord June 13. Exam June 25 at 12.15.  
 Wheeler, John James, Leytonstone, Essex, Builder. High Court. Order made under section 108. Ord June 13. Exam July 22 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Wickham, C. T., Burghley rd, Camden rd, Cheesemonger's Manager. High Court. Pet May 15. Ord June 12. Exam July 22 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Witts, Frederick, Ross, Herefordshire, Bootseller. Hereford. Pet June 10. Ord June 11. Exam June 27.

## FIRST MEETINGS.

Bainbridge, John Joseph, Gateshead, Durham, Whitesmith. June 26 at 12. Official Receiver, County chbrs, Westgate rd, Newcastle on Tyne.  
 Clark, Clarissa, and George Clark, Friar st, Doctors' common, Bookbinders. June 25 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn.  
 Elkmann, Jacob Heinrich Ludwig, Gt Tower st, Wine Agent. June 26 at 3. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.  
 Francis, Evan, Merthyr Tydfil, Labourer. June 30 at 12. Official Receiver, Merthyr Tydfil.  
 Francis, Thomas, Rhonda Valley, Glamorganshire, Grocer. July 1 at 12. Official Receiver, Merthyr Tydfil.  
 Goose, William, Frampton, Lincolnshire, Farmer. June 24 at 11. Official Receiver, 45, High st, Boston.  
 Greaves, James, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. June 25 at 11. Official Receiver, Whitehall chbrs, Colmore row, Birmingham.  
 Hudson, John William and Co, Nottingham, Timber Merchants. June 24 at 12. Official Receiver, Exchange walk, Nottingham.  
 Hume, James Robert, Sunderland, Licensed Victualler. June 24 at 12. Official Receiver, 21 Fawcett st, Sunderland.  
 Jones, John Samuel, Merthyr Tydfil, Clothier. June 26 at 12. Official Receiver, Ogden's chbrs, Bridge st, Manchester.  
 Osborne, Henry John, Nottingham, Builder. June 25 at 12. Official Receiver, Exchange walk, Nottingham.  
 Perkins, John, Sandwich, Kent, Wine Merchant. June 26 at 12. First Avenue Hotel, High Holborn.  
 Pilliner, Edward, Brockley, Kent, no occupation. July 1 at 11. Official Receiver, 100, Victoria st, Westminster.  
 Queenan, James, Sunderland, Picture Framers. June 24 at 1. Official Receiver, 21, Fawcett st, Sunderland.  
 Stocks, Alfred, Messingham, Lincolnshire, Farmer. June 27 at 2. Official Receiver, 3, Haven st, Gt Grimsby.  
 Townsend, Joseph, Liversedge, Yorkshire, Currier. June 25 at 3. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Batley.  
 Wainwright, Henry, Maidenhead, Licensed Victualler. June 24 at 11. Official Receiver, 109, Victoria st, Westminster.  
 Warrington, James, Fenton, Staffordshire, Beerseller. June 25 at 11. North Stafford Station Hotel, Stoke upon Trent.

West, Will  
Portugal  
Witts, Fre  
Hotel, G

Ackroyd, J

Pet June

Bailey, Fr

June 13

Balaam, W

Ord June

Clarke, Ro

37, Ord

Collins, Jo

Ord June

Collison, W

Ord June

Dale, Alfre

Ord June

Davies, Ben

Ord June

Eagles, Ch

Pet June

Farrell, Jo

June 12

Garth, Jos

Goose, Will

June 14

Greaves, J

Ord June

Hayward,

Pet May

Kirby, Wa

Ord June

Lavender,

June 14

Marrison,

June 11

McQuilton,

Perkins, J

June 14

Perkins, S

Ord June

Russell, Fr

Wells, F

Rose, Hen

Ord June

Seefield, H

Mar 19

Shand, Wil

Strauss, Ch

Pet June

Taylor, Fr

ford, Pe

Townend,

June 13

Wainwright

Ord June

Walmesley

Pet May

SCHW

Arti

Guarantee

The Fac

tely dige

Mapper, a

Highly

Being wi

all palat

times the

with starch

Mixtures.

Made inst

to a Bre

COCOA

cheapest

In tins at

Charitie

H. SCHW

LAW.

Law

Advocacy,

Office in

X. Z., Offi

LAW.

keep

Deeds or

married.

Salary ac

reference.

LAW.

desti

Address, E

Herts.

A SON

country.

B. H. San

A BA

desires to

Purchase

where his

viable.

thought

Office "So



West, William, Leytonstone, Essex, Stevedore. June 24 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's Inn fields.  
Wills, Frederick, Ross, Herefordshire, Bootseller. June 26 at 3. Wellington Hotel, Gloucester.

## ADJUDICATIONS.

Akroyd, Joss, Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, Grocer. Northampton. Pet June 14. Ord June 14.  
Bailey, Frederick Harvey, Chislehurst, Jeweller. Croydon. Pet May 29. Ord June 13.  
Balaam, William, Union rd, Southwark, Carpenter. High Court. Pet May 23. Ord June 13.  
Clarke, Robert, Fliskerton, Nottinghamshire, Draper. Nottingham. Pet May 27. Ord June 11.  
Collins, John, Chagford, Devonshire, Grocer. East Stonehouse. Pet May 12. Ord June 13.  
Collison, Walter, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Nottingham. Pet May 20. Ord June 11.  
Dale, Alfred John, Vauxhall bridge rd, out of business. Leicester. Pet May 10. Ord June 12.  
Davies, Benjamin, Ebbw Vale, Monmouthshire, Tailor. Tredegar. Pet April 29. Ord June 13.  
Eagles, Christian, Union rd, Tufnell park, Commission Merchant. High Court. Pet June 13. Ord June 13.  
Farrell, Joseph George, Liverpool, Horse Dealer. Liverpool. Pet May 23. Ord June 12.  
Garth, Joshua, Leeds, Innkeeper. Leeds. Pet June 11. Ord June 12.  
Goose, William, Frampton, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Boston. Pet June 9. Ord June 14.  
Greaves, James, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. Birmingham. Pet June 12. Ord June 13.  
Hayward, William, Bishops Nympton, Devonshire, Innkeeper. Barnstaple. Pet May 2. Ord June 13.  
Kirby, Walter Frederick, Northampton, Baker. Northampton. Pet May 24. Ord June 13.  
Lavender, Thomas W., Ramsgate, Plasterer. Canterbury. Pet May 30. Ord June 14.  
Marrison, Edwin James, Nottingham, Baker. Nottingham. Pet May 3. Ord June 11.  
McQuilton, William, Bristol, Grocer. Bristol. Pet June 9. Ord June 14.  
Perkins, John, Sandwich, Wine Merchant. Canterbury. Pet June 12. Ord June 14.  
Perkins, Samuel, Knowle, Warwickshire, Baker. Birmingham. Pet May 31. Ord June 13.  
Russell, Francis Jefferies, Shepton Mallett, Somersetshire, Licensed Victualler. Wells. Pet May 10. Ord June 10.  
Rose, Henry Wilson, Malton, Yorkshire, Tailor. Scarborough. Pet May 26. Ord June 10.  
Seefield, Hyman Joachim, Redcross st, Wholesale Clothier. High Court. Pet Mar 19. Ord June 12.  
Shand, William Francis, Cannon st. High Court. Pet April 16. Ord June 12.  
Strauss, Charles, Newcastle on Tyne, Boot Manufacturer. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet June 4. Ord June 14.  
Taylor, Frederick, and John Taylor, Bradford, Yorkshire, Corn Factors. Bradford. Pet May 30. Ord June 14.  
Townend, Joseph, Liversedge, Yorkshire, Currier. Dewsbury. Pet May 30. Ord June 13.  
Wainwright, Henry, Maidenhead, Licensed Victualler. Windsor. Pet May 24. Ord June 12.  
Walmeley, Thomas, Gloucester terrace, Camden hill, Gentleman. High Court. Pet May 12. Ord June 12.

Ward, Alexander John Walter, Royal Exchange bldgs, Manager of a Public Company. High Court. Pet May 28. Ord June 12.  
Wills, Frederick, Ross, Herefordshire, Bootseller. Hereford. Pet June 19. Ord June 11.  
Wright, Henry, Rochester, Kent, Plumber. Rochester. Pet May 29. Ord June 12.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 28s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

## CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS .....	591	Ex parte Cunningham .....	597
THE EFFECT OF "VESTING STREETS" IN LOCAL AUTHORITIES .....	592	Holgate v. Shutt .....	597
THE BANKRUPTCY ACT IN OPERATION .....	593	Ex parte Rogers .....	598
REVIEWS .....	594	Hunter, Appellant; Johnson, Respondent .....	598
THE NEW PRACTICE:—		Troward v. Troward .....	598
In re Wilkinson .....	595	SOCIETIES .....	598
PRACTICE APPEALS .....	595	LAWYERS IN SEARCH OF A DESIGNATION .....	600
BANKRUPTCY CASES .....	595	OBITUARY .....	601
CASES OF THE WEEK:—		LEGAL APPOINTMENTS .....	601
Ex parte Clark .....	596	LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK .....	601
The Board of Works for the Wandsworth District v. The United Telephone Company (Limited) .....	596	THE NEW CIRCUIT ARRANGEMENTS .....	602
		COURT PAPERS .....	603
		COMPANIES .....	606
		CREDITORS' CLAIMS .....	606
		LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c. ....	617

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.—All communications intended for publication in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the return of rejected communications.

\* \* \* The Publisher requests that early application should be made by persons desirous of obtaining back numbers of the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, as only a small number of copies remain on hand.

## SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.  
Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.  
Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates keeps for years in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and in reality cheaper than such mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful of in a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.  
COCOATINA & LA VARELLA is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Manna Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tins at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,  
H. SCHWEITZER & Co., 10, Adam-st., Strand, London, W.

**LAW.**—A Gentleman, experienced in Common Law and General Practice, and accustomed to Advocacy, desires an Engagement in a Solicitor's Office in or near London. Admitted.—Address, X.Z., Office of this Paper.

**LAW.**—Situation Wanted.—Cashier, Book-keeper, &c. Can draw Abstracts, engross Deeds or Probates; good handwriting; middle-aged; married. Town or country; could reside on premises. Salary according to responsibility; 20 years' experience.—G., 4, Birkbeck-road, West Dulwich.

**LAW.**—Advertiser, recently admitted, desires Conveyancing or General Clerkship.—Address, H. R., 2, Queen Anne-villas, Waltham Cross, Herts.

**A SOLICITOR** (Honours, 1884) desires a Conveyancing or General Clerkship, town or country. Good references.—Address, LEX, care of R. H. Sanders, Esq., Solicitor, Bromsgrove.

**A BARRISTER** of six years' standing, with considerable experience in Conveyancing, desires to become a Solicitor, and would be glad to purchase a share in a well-established business where his knowledge of Conveyancing would be serviceable. He would introduce business, and, if thought desirable, capital also.—Address, BAR, Office "Solicitors' Journal," 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

## EDE AND SON,

## ROBE MAKERS,



BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.

## SOLICITORS' GOWNS

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS

ESTABLISHED 1860.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON

**HIPPOLYTE CHAUSAREE, Esq.** (deceased).  
**WANTED,** the Will of the above.—Apply to Messrs. STEPHARD, GIBSON, & Co., 21, Leadenhall-street, London, Solicitors.

**IF you want Money without Fees**—amounts £10 to £1,000—before applying elsewhere see Mr. HILTON, personally if possible, 40, Great Tower-street.

**UNIVERSITIES, Civil Service, Legal, and Medical Preliminary, and other Examinations.** Pupils from fourteen years of age prepared by a Tutor and Public Examiner of nineteen years' experience; late Fellow of his College.—Rev. W. H. ROWLANDSON, M.A., Great Brasted Rectory, Witham, Essex.

Freehold Chambers in New-square for Investment or early occupation.

**MESSRS. PHILIP D. TUCKETT & CO.** will SELL BY AUCTION, at the MART, E.C., on MONDAY, JULY 21, at ONE o'clock, in Two Lots, two very convenient sets of Freehold Chambers, upon the second and third floors of No. 1, New-square, Lincoln's-inn, within a few yards of the new Law Courts, and in the best possible position for Members of the Bar and Legal Profession. Leased for short terms.

Particulars of Mr. T. W. Gibbs, jun., Solicitor, 5, Northumberland-buildings, Bath; or of the Auctioneers, Messrs. Philip D. Tuckett & Co., 10A, Old Broad-street, London, W.C.

By order of the Executors of the late W. J. Payne, Esq., Reigate.—"Fonthill," a Family Residence, in an elevated position, in Ringley Park. The House contains spacious hall, three reception rooms, billiard room, 12 bed rooms, bath and dressing rooms, stabling, coachman's apartments, outbuildings, pleasure grounds, garden, conservatory, greenhouses, and paddock.

**MR. JOHN LEES will SELL BY AUCTION,** at the MART, London, on THURSDAY, JUNE 26, at ONE o'clock precisely, the LEASE of the above Residence, in perfect order, with possession.

Further particulars may be obtained of F. T. Aston, Esq., Solicitor, 58, Lombard-street, E.C.; G. Carter Morrison, Esq., Solicitor, Reigate; Morrisons, 94, Cannon-street; W. Percy Morrison, Esq., Solicitor, Red Hill; and of Mr. John Lees, Auctioneer and Land Agent, Reigate.

## SURREY.

**NUTFIELD and BLECHINGLEY**, in the heart of a charming residential district, and within an hour of London.—Important Freehold Estate of 120 acres of land, beautifully situated, with a frontage of 1,100 yards to the main road, leading from Red Hill to Westerham, and adjoining the picturesque village of Nutfield, two miles from Red Hill Junction Station on the South-Eastern and Brighton Railways. The property is upwards of 500 feet above the sea; the air is dry and bracing; the land undulating, studded with handsome timber, with a sandy subsoil, and commands a panoramic view of great extent and rare beauty over the weald of Kent, Surrey, and Sussex. There is a convenient house with stabling and walled garden, also Nutfield Windmill, with smith's shop and other premises. Sand with material for road-making and other purposes exist on the spot. The sporting is good and the estate within the meets of several packs of hounds; gas and water mains extend the whole length of the road, and the property offers a rare opportunity for acquiring sites for first-class residences or for other building purposes.

**MR. JOHN LEES is instructed to SELL BY AUCTION,** at the MART, London, on THURSDAY, JUNE 26, at TWELVE for ONE o'clock, in Four Lots, the above important and attractive FREEHOLD PROPERTY.

Particulars may be obtained of G. Carter Morrison, Esq., Solicitor, Reigate; Morrisons, 94, Cannon-street, E.C.; W. Percy Morrison, Esq., Solicitor, Red Hill; Daniel Clarke, Esq., Solicitor, High Wycombe; at the Mart; and of Mr. John Lees, Auctioneer and Land Agent, Reigate.

# NORTHERN FIRE AND LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1836.

ABERDEEN: 3, KING STREET.

LONDON: 1, MOORGATE STREET.

ACCUMULATED FUNDS, £2,890,000.

**THE FORTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING** of the Company was held within their house at Aberdeen on **FRIDAY**, 18th June, 1884, when the Directors' Report was adopted, and a **DIVIDEND** of £1 per Share, free of Income-tax, was DECLARED. The following are extracts from the Report submitted:—

## FIRE DEPARTMENT.

The **PREMIUMS** received last year amounted to £520,204 19s. 8d., which, compared with £460,133 6s. in the previous year, show the substantial increase of £60,070 12s. 8d. A noteworthy feature of this increase is that it is spread in satisfactory proportions over all the main sections of the Company's business.

The **LOSSES**, though not so heavy as in 1882, were again above the average, and amounted to £330,186 17s. 3d., or 63·47 per cent. of the Premiums. The general average of the Company's experience from the beginning is now 69·39 per cent.

The **EXPENSES** of MANAGEMENT (including commission to agents and

charges of every kind) came to £160,877 8s. 10d., or 30·93 per cent. of the Premiums. This is an increase of 1·31 per cent. compared with the previous year, and is principally due to the introduction of certain important changes, from which beneficial results are ultimately expected, in the management of the business in the United States.

The result is that, after reserving the usual 33 per cent. of the Premiums to cover liabilities under current Policies, a profit was earned of £9,115 10s., which sum has been transferred to the credit of the General Account of Profit and Loss.

## LIFE DEPARTMENT.

**ASSURANCE BRANCH.**—The new Assurances during the year, after deduction of Re-assurances, reached in the aggregate the sum of £377,706, of which £31,775 was for Endowment Assurances payable at death or on the attainment of a specified age. These new Assurances yielded annual Premiums amounting to £12,000 9s. 9d., and single Premiums amounting to £1,077 16s. 10d.

The total **INCOME** of the year (including interest) was £251,572 18s. 9d.

The **CLAIMS** amounted to £114,465 2s. 7d., of which the sum of £2,668 6s. 8d. was for Endowments and Endowment Assurances payable during life.

The **EXPENSES** of MANAGEMENT (including commission) were limited to 10 per cent. of the Premiums received.

**ANNUITY BRANCH.**—The sum of £6,296 1s. 4d. was received for Annuities granted during the year.

The whole **FUNDS** of the Life Department now amount to £1,778,290 6s. 9d., showing an increase for the year of £107,780 13s. 7d.

## DIVIDEND.

The Balance at the credit of Profit and Loss (including the sum brought forward from the previous year, and the profit on the Fire Account of 1883) amounts, after charging the interim dividend of £1 per Share paid in December

last, to £38,469 15s. 2d. Out of this sum the Directors recommend that a further dividend of £1 per Share be now declared, making a total distribution of profits for the year of £60,000, and leaving £28,469 15s. 2d. to be carried forward.

## LONDON BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

CHAIRMAN—SIR WILLIAM MILLER BART.

Colonel ROBERT BARING.

ERNEST CHAPLIN, Esq.

PHILIP CURRIE, Esq., C.B.

GEORGE JOHN FENWICK, Esq.

ALEXANDER PEARSON FLETCHER, Esq.

ALEXANDER HEUN GOSCHEN, Esq.

FIRE DEPARTMENT—JAMES ROBB, Manager.

SECRETARY—H. E. WILSON.

WILLIAM EGERTON HUBBARD, Esq.

FERDINAND MARSHALL HUTH, Esq.

HENRY JAMES LUBBOCK, Esq.

JOHN STEWART, Esq.

WILLIAM WALKINSHAW, Esq.

LIFE DEPARTMENT—THOS. H. COOKE, Actuary.

GENERAL MANAGER—JAS. VALENTINE.

Copies of the Report, with the whole accounts of the Company for the year 1883, may be obtained from any of the Company's offices or agencies.

**MESSRS. JOHNSON & DYMOND** beg to announce that their sales by Auction of Plate, Watches, Chains, Jewellery, Precious Stones, &c., are held on Mondays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays.

The attention of Solicitors, Executors, Trustees, and others is particularly called to this ready means for the disposal of Property of deceased and other clients.

In consequence of the frequency of their sales, Messrs. J. & D. are enabled to include large or small quantities at short notice (if required).

Sales of Furniture held at private houses.

Valuations for Probate or Transfer. Terms on application to the City Auction Rooms (established 1793), 38 and 39, Gracechurch-street, E.C.

Messrs. Johnson & Dymond beg to notify that their Auction Sales of Wearing Apparel, Piece Goods, Household and Office Furniture, Carpets, Bedding, &c., are held on each day of the week (Saturday excepted).

## AUCTION ROOMS

Specially for the Sale of Literary Property, Music, and Works of Art, 47, LEICESTER SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

**MESSRS. PUTTICK & SIMPSON** beg to announce that the above rooms are open daily for the reception of all kinds of Literary and Art Property, Musical Collections, &c., intended for Sale by Auction. Messrs. P. & S. feel assured that the necessary knowledge (gained only by long experience) and the extensive connection enjoyed by their firm will be a sufficient guarantee to solicitors and others that such property entrusted to their care will be arranged for sale in the most advantageous manner.

Valuations for Probate or Legacy Duty, or for Public or Private Sale.

ESTABLISHED (IN PICCADILLY) 1794.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER'S** LIST of ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

**HODGKINSON & CO.'S** Hand-made Account Book and other Papers—the most suitable for Bankers, Merchants, and others—can be obtained through all Stationers.

## THE NEW LEGAL QUARTER.

**OFFICES and RESIDENTIAL CHAMBERS** to LET, with outlook on THAMES EMBANKMENT, half a minute's walk from Temple Station. Splendid suite of offices on first floor, six rooms communicating (with bay windows). Rent, including rates and taxes, £325 per annum. Residential Chambers on upper floors.—Address, THE SECRETARY, The Law Land Company, Limited, the Outer Temple opposite the Law Courts.

**TO SOLICITORS and Others** wanting West-end Offices.—Messrs. BEAL, SON, & CLARKES have several desirable Sets to Let at rents from £50 to £200 a year. A list sent on receipt of a note of requirements. Apply at the Estate Offices, 20, Regent-street, Waterloo-place, S.W.

**SUN FIRE AND LIFE OFFICES,** Threadneedle-street, E.C.; Charing Cross, S.W.;

**FIRE.** Established 1710. Home and Foreign Insurances at moderate rates.

**LIFE.** Established 1810. Specially low rates for young lives. Large bonuses. Immediate settlement of claims.

**REVERSIONARY and LIFE INTERESTS** in LANDED or FUNDED PROPERTY or other Securities and Annuities PURCHASED or Loans or Annuities thereon granted by the **EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY (LIMITED)**, 10, Lancaster-place, Waterloo Bridge, Strand. Established 1835. Capital, £200,000. Interest on Loans may be capitalized.

F. S. CLAYTON, } Joint  
C. H. CLAYTON, } Secretaries.

**NORTHERN ASSURANCE COMPANY** Established 1836.

**FIRE AND LIFE. AT HOME AND ABROAD.** LONDON: 1, Moorgate-street, E.C. ABERDEEN: 3, King-street.

**INCOME & FUNDS (1883):—**  
Fire Premiums ... .. £320,000  
Life Premiums ... .. 184,000  
Interest ... .. 124,000  
Accumulated Funds ... .. £2,890,000

**LIFE ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND;** (For Life Assurance and Annuities.)

**FUNDS** ... .. £2,740,000  
**ANNUAL REVENUE** ... .. £470,400

**LOANS** made on Freeholds, Leaseholds, and other Securities, including Life Interests, and Absolute or Contingent Reversions. Loans upon Reversions are made at annual interest, or in consideration of a deferred charge.

London: 5, Lombard-street, and 133, Pall Mall; Edinburgh: 83, Princes-street.

**THE COMMERCIAL UNION ASSURANCE COMPANY.—FIRE, LIFE, MARINE.**

Capital fully subscribed ... .. £2,500,000  
Capital paid-up ... .. 250,000  
Life Fund in Special Trust for Life Policy-holders exceeds ... .. 813,000  
Other Funds exceed ... .. 1,000,000  
**TOTAL INVESTED FUNDS UPWARDS OF TWO MILLIONS.**

Total Annual Premium Income exceeds .. 1,065,000  
**UNITED OFFICES:** 19 AND 20, CORNHILL, LONDON, E.C.  
**WEST END OFFICE:** 8, PALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.

**LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.** Chief Office—126 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.

The Funds in hand and Capital Subscribed amount to nearly £1,900,000 sterling.

Chairman—JAMES CUDDELL, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Middle Temple.

Deputy-Chairman—C. FRANKSTON, Esq. (Lee & Pemberton), Solicitor, 44, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

The Directors invite attention to the New Form of Life Policy, which is free from all conditions.

This is the Bonus Year, and all Policies effected on the "With Profits Scale" before the 30th of November next will participate.

Policies of Insurance granted against the contingency of Issue at moderate rates of Premium.

The Company ADVANCES Money on Mortgage of Life Interests and Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.

The Company also purchases Reversions, giving the vendor the option of re-purchase within a limited period, whether the tenant for life be living or not.

Prospectuses, copies of the Directors' Reports and Annual Balance Sheet, and every information, sent post-free on application to

**FRANK MCGEDY, Actuary and Secretary.**